CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canada

NL 339 (r. 85/09)

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

47

TC –

ISBN 0-315-21242-X

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur

RICHARD HENRY KRAUSE

Date of Birth – Date de naissance

SEPT. 9, 1954

Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien

☑ Yes / Oui ☐ No / Non

Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance

CANADA

Permanent Address – Résidence fixe

9011 - 151 ST.
EDMONTON, AB.
T5R 1J4

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse

ULRICH VON ZATZIKHOVEN'S LANZELET AND THE 'URLANZELET':
A RECONSIDERATION OF MEDIEVAL EPIC CHRONOLOGY

Degree for which thesis was presented
Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

MASTER OF ARTS

Year this degree conferred
Année d'obtention de ce grade

1985

University – Université

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse

DR. EUGENE EGERT

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature

Date

APRIL 2, 1985

NL-91 (r. 84/03)

Canada

Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet and the Urlanzelet: A Reconsideration of Medieval Epic Chronology

by

RICHARD H. KRAUSE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN

GERMAN LITERATURE

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Richard H. Krause

TITLE OF THESIS: Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet and the Urlanzelet: A Reconsideration of Medieval Epic Chronology

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Spring, 1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)...

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Department of Germanic Languages
Arts 206
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2E6

DATED April 3, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet and the Urlanzelet: A Reconsideration of Medieval Epic Chronology submitted by Richard H. Krause in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in German Literature.

Eugene Faut
Supervisor

Richard d'Algen

E. D. Blodgett

Date January 21, 1985

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my thesis advisor, Dr. Eugene Egert, in thankful recognition of the helpful instruction and advice I have received from him, and to Valerie Cameron in appreciation for her patience and industry in typing this thesis for me.

Abstract

Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Middle High German epic, the Lanzelet, and the French source from which it was derived have been the subjects of controversy ever since the early nineteenth century, a controversy which often revolved around the question of their date of composition and of their relationship to other medieval courtly epics. These questions have never been satisfactorily resolved, although numerous scholars now agree in dating the Lanzelet after Hartmann's epics and in dating Ulrich's French source, the Urlanzelet, after many of Chrétien's epics, and tacitly accept that Ulrich and the author of the Urlanzelet were epigons who extensively borrowed from the epics of their alleged predecessors, Hartmann and Chrétien. It is the contention of this thesis that such a conclusion about the relationship of the Lanzelet and Urlanzelet to contemporary medieval epic literature is unwarranted. This thesis therefore undertakes to re-examine the evidence pertaining to the nature and date of composition of these epics. Firstly, the relationship of the Urlanzelet to Chrétien's epics and to other medieval versions of the Lancelot legend and its component episodes is ascertained through a comparison of the motifs shared by them, whereby the basic content of the Urlanzelet can be reconstructed. Secondly, MHG literature is checked for clues to the chronology of the MHG courtly epic. Then it is determined whether or not those features shared by the Lanzelet and contemporary MHG epics which also have parallels in the reconstructed Urlanzelet and/or in Chrétien's epics can be traced back to the Urlanzelet as their ultimate source more frequently than to Chrétien's works. Finally, the evidence thus adduced is utilised together with a brief analysis of the structure

and literary function of the Lanzelet in order to vindicate Ulrich and the author of the Urlanzelet as epic writers of some stature, to absolve them of the label of "epigon," and to underline the literary value of their works.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Survey of Lanzelet-Research	2
	1. The Discussion	2
	2. The Problems	6
	NOTES	9
II.	THE LANZELET AND ITS FRENCH SOURCE	12
	A. The Existence of Ulrich's Source	12
	B. The Nature of Ulrich's Source	14
	C. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Epics	15
	1. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Perceval	15
	2. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Ivain	20
	3. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Cligès	23
	4. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Erec	26
	5. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Chevalier de la Charrette	28
	D. The Sources of the Urlanzelet and of Chrétien's CdlC	33
	E. The Relative Chronology of the Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Epics	43
	F. The Relationship Between the Lanzelet and Urlanzelet	49
	NOTES	51
III.	THE DATE OF COMPOSITION OF THE LANZELET AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CONTEMPORARY MHG EPICS	57
	A. The Problem	57
	B. Dating the Lanzelet through References to it in Other MHG Epics	58
	C. Dating MHG Epics through Authors' Allusions to Historical Events	61
	D. Dating the Lanzelet through Parallels to Other Literary Works	73
	1. The Lanzelet and Wirnt's Wigalois	74
	2. The Lanzelet and Wolfram's Parzival	77
	3. The Lanzelet and Hartmann's Epics	89

E. Dating MHG Epics through a Comparative Study of Vocabulary, Rhyme, Meter, and Style 112

F. Conclusion 114

NOTES 116

IV. THE LITERARY VALUE OF THE LANZELET 126

A. Structure and Themes in the Lanzelet 126

B. Conclusion 130

NOTES 132

BIBLIOGRAPHY 134

Primary Sources 134

Secondary Sources 135

I. Introduction

The MHG epic Lanzelet, penned by the Swiss cleric Ulrich von Zatzikhoven about the turn of the thirteenth century, has generally been relegated to the status of "Unterhaltungsroman,"[1] "Epigonenwerk,"[2] "niedere Artusepik,"[3] or "Dekadenzroman"[4] by literary critics and it is only within the last three decades that researchers have begun to thoroughly analyse it and impartially evaluate its literary merits or lack of them. Ulrich's lone surviving work has especially suffered from comparison with the courtly epics of the more illustrious and prolific medieval German authors, Hartmann von Aue and Wolfram von Eschenbach, whose adaptations of Arthurian material can readily be compared with their French counterparts and antecedents (Chrétien's works) whereas the Lanzelet stands isolated because Ulrich's alleged French source no longer exists as a point of reference. Literary critics have therefore generally come to accept the works of Chrétien de Troyes as the standard against which all other Arthurian epics, the Lanzelet included, should be measured, and since the latter, unlike Hartmann's epics or Wolfram's Parzival, is not an adaptation of one of Chrétien's poems, it thus fails to conform to the accepted pattern and has usually been considered inferior. Most studies of the Lanzelet have therefore been biased and/or superficial. This thesis will attempt, at least in part, to rehabilitate Ulrich's work and/or its alleged French source.

A. Survey of Lanzelet-Research

1. The Discussion

In spite of the dearth of competent studies on the Lanzelet, Ulrich's epic has been the subject of much controversy ever since literary scholars first turned their attention in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to the MHG courtly epic. Attempts to identify the dialect in which the Lanzelet was composed and thereby ascertain the nationality of its author led to one of the first controversies over Ulrich's poem. Hofstäter, one of the first critics of Ulrich's work, described him as "einer der ältesten schwäbischen Dichter aus dem zwölften Jahrhunderte."[5] This view was soon opposed by Goedeke, who located Ulrich in Bavaria[6] in spite of Lachmann's earlier reference to "der vermuthlich thurgäuischen Mundart Ulrichs."[7] Others, such as Wilhelm Grimm[8] and Franz Pfeiffer,[9] pointed to possible Low German elements in the Lanzelet alongside Ulrich's native Swiss dialect. However, closer scrutiny soon revealed that these alleged Low German elements were actually typical of the Alemannic dialect spoken in the Thurgau. Haupt,[10] Jänicke,[11] and Bächtold[12] thus situated the Lanzelet's author in the Thurgau as well. A document discovered by Bächtold which mentioned a priest named Ulrich von Zatzikhoven residing in the village of Lommis in 1214 served to further confirm the accuracy of Lachmann's linguistic analysis, which was by then generally accepted as correct.[13]

The lost source of the Lanzelet furnished another topic of debate. Initially it was assumed by Adelung,[14] Hofstäter,[15] Fauriel,[16] Bächtold,[17] and Raynouard[18] that Ulrich's source was identical with a lost epic on Lancelot composed by the Provencal poet Arnaud Daniel. This misconception was later conclusively refuted as groundless speculation by Gaston

Paris.[19] However the Lanzelet or, more accurately, the lost French original which Ulrich claimed to have translated, remained a subject of controversy because of its implications for various theories about the development of the Arthurian romance. Some critics, Jessie Weston,[20] K.G.T. Webster[21] and Samuel Singer[22] among others, viewed the Lanzelet as a faithful rendition of one of the first primitive attempts at unifying a series of lays within an epic framework to create a new literary genre, the Arthurian epic. Meanwhile others, notably Wendelin Förster,[23] Wolfgang Golther,[24] James Bruce,[25] and Stefan Hofer,[26] regarded Ulrich's epic or its source as an inept compilation of stock Arthurian motifs, themes, and episodes borrowed from the supposedly older classical Arthurian epics. As Pérennec aptly remarks:

> "on voit apparaître les images contradictoires d'un Lanzelet, témoin d'un stade ancien de l'évolution de la tradition arthurienne, et d'un Lanzelet, roman décadent."[27]

As yet no consensus exists as to the nature of the "welschez buoch" which Ulrich claimed to have translated.

Closely linked to this discussion of the Lanzelet's role in the evolution of the Arthurian epic is the problem of establishing the date of composition of Ulrich's work and of its alleged French source. Here, too, the debate has not yet been conclusively resolved although Pérennec's comment reveals that the majority of scholars consider Hartmann's Erec at least to have been composed prior to Ulrich's epic:

> Si les germanistes ont abouti à un certain consensus (Le Lanzelet dans tous les cas postérieur à Erec), cet accord résulte plus de la lassitude générale qu'il ne découle d'une conviction véritable."[28]

The evidence is, however, ambivalent and the relative date of composition and the nature of Ulrich's source must be determined before the merits of any theory as to the date of composition of the Lanzelet can be accurately evaluated.

Controversy has also erupted over the moral or spiritual values communicated by Ulrich's work and over the Lanzelet's literary merit or lack of it. Thus several researchers have shown a tendency to deny the Lanzelet any literary worth because of what they perceive to be the low moral standards portrayed in the work. Gervinus, who does not seem to have read the Lanzelet very carefully, sets the example when he claims:

> "Die Zuchtlosigkeit ist ... beinahe grundsätzlich. Über die obscönsten Dinge wird hier ruhig weggegangen als müsse es so sein; ... in Lanzelot ... aber ist das Hässliche nicht einmal mit dem Reiz der Darstellung verschönert; ... Solch ein durchaus stumpfes moralisches Gefühl herrscht hier überall."[29]

He goes on to remark:

> "Noch liegt hier eine Reihe langweiliger Geschichten ohne Verbindung, ohne innere Bedeutung, hintereinander; ... Kein Schluss einer Begebenheit, kein Schluss des Ganzen, kein fesselndes Ereignis, keine kleinste Intrigue, keine Leidenschaft, kein Gefühl, weder im Dichter noch in seinen Geschöpfen, kein Bild, keine Sprache, kein Leben, und selbst wo der Vortrag lebhaft geschildert sein soll ... selbst da kein Leben."[30]

This view is immediately challenged by K. Hahn, who attempts to vindicate Ulrich as a poet and who perceives that the supposedly morally objectionable elements have a function in structuring the Lanzelet.[31] Bächtold also objects to Gervinus' criticisms and opines:

> "Findet sich doch im ganzen Lied keine einzige Stelle, die selbst nach unsern heutigen moralischen Begriffen den Anstand verletzte."

However, he also admits that "Lanzelet ... viel zu viel mit dem Weibervolk zu schaffen hat ...."[32] Behre's argument in this regard is especially telling because he points out that the aspects of the Lanzelet to which Gervinus objected are more or less typical of all medieval courtly epics.[33]

Nevertheless authors of literary handbooks and histories such as A. Vilmar[34] and F. Vogt[35] have generally followed Gervinus' example. Even Ehrismann assumes a moralising attitude vis-à-vis the Lanzelet, claiming:

> "Auf Unterhaltung durch merkwürdige Begebenheiten ist es abgesehen, seelische Probleme kennt diese am Äusseren haftende Erzählungsweise nicht. Der Grundfehler liegt in der Arbeitsweise des Urhebers, ... er häuft Abenteuer und Motivwiederholungen aufeinander, ohne eine innere Verbindung im Charakter des Helden herzustellen, daher die abstossenden Wiederverheiratungen des 'wipsaeligen Lanzelet'..."[36]

Ehrismann thus sees "die bloss äusserliche Komposition der Erweiterung durch Motivwiederholung" as one of the causes of the "moralischen Ungeheuerlichkeiten" and the "Lüsternheit" of the women in Ulrich's poem.[37]

Gerhard Eis is even more cutting in his discussion of Ulrich von Zatzikhoven in the Verfasserlexikon:

> "Die ungefüge Art, wie hier ein in doppeltem Sinne roher Stoff eingedeutscht ward, ist ungewöhnlich. Es ist eine bedenkenlose Kompilation von verschiedenartigem Strandgut barbarischer Herkunft, ohne Rücksicht auf die gesellschaftlichen und christlichen Satzungen des fortgeschrittenen Jahrhunderts .... Die Episoden werden nur äusserlich zusammengehalten .... Es kam ihm (i.e. Ulrich) in der Hauptsache darauf an, durch die Häufung der Abenteuer zu fesseln .... Die Minne erscheint bei ihm nur als grobsinnlicher Trieb, die Frauen sind lüstern und niedrig, der Held ist ein unersättlicher Buhler.[38]

Here again the alleged moral degeneracy of the Lanzelet is taken as a sign of its lack of depth and is linked to supposed structural deficiencies.

M. O'C. Walshe reiterates these criticisms in 1962:

> "It is clear that the poem is extremely naïve, with no higher claim to literary excellence, and indeed with singularly few moral scruples."[39]

More recent research, however, has suggested that the Lanzelet has a definite structure which reveals the work's implicit didactic function. Thus Soudek claims that:

> "Ulrich bei der Abfassung seines Gedichtes einen ganz bestimmten, ethisch hochstehenden und über den der vorhöfischen Epik eigenen Hang zum blossen Unterhalten hinausgehenden Zweck verfolgte."[40]

Similarly, Klaus Schmidt attributes "strukturbildende Kräfte" to the "Frauenbegegnungen,"[41] while Max Wehrli writes:

> "In den Minnebeziehungen des 'wipsaelegen' Helden scheint weniger eine höfische Libertinage zu walten, als vielmehr die Exemplifikation verschiedener Casus im Sinne des Traktats des Kaplans Andreas."[42]

These more recent studies and others like them have as yet only set the stage for an objective, unprejudiced discussion of the Lanzelet's structure and of its literary value, a discussion which is sorely needed.

2. The Problems

A renewed discussion of the Lanzelet is imperative because, although earlier research contributed much to our understanding of Ulrich's skill as a versifier and to our knowledge of his linguistic and historical background, until recently most analyses of Ulrich's epic have tended to be very subjective or at best inconclusive and many controversies remain unresolved. In the discussion of the Lanzelet's date of composition, for example, when critics were confronted with verses in Ulrich's epic which betrayed an unmistakable kinship to passages in Hartmann's Erec or Wolfram's Parzival, they often automatically rejected the possibility that Ulrich could have influenced his contemporaries, simply because Ulrich was supposedly a lesser poet and therefore more likely to imitate others rather than to be imitated. That was, for instance, Schilling's rationale:

> "Accedit quod in usu loquendi Ulrici et Hartmanni in Erekio multa, quae utrique sunt communia, reperiuntur, quae, quin ex Erekio prius scripto mutuatus sit Ulricus, nemo dubitabit. Quis enim censeat, Hartmannum, poëtam magnae indolis, virum humanitate atque urbanitate politissimum, cujus carmina summa sint orationis suavitate atque elegantia, sectatum esse Ulricum, incultum sermone, ingenio tenuem, qui inter poëtas, qui illa literarum nostrarum aetate praeclarissima vivebant, nullo modo excelleat?"[43]
>
> (Moreover, no one will doubt that many turns of speech found in Hartmann's Erec and Ulrich's epic which are common to both authors were borrowed by Ulrich from Erec, which had been composed earlier. Would anyone ever believe that Hartmann, a poet of great talent and a man most refined, cultured, and eloquent, whose verse is the epitome of poetic grace and elegance, could be indebted to

> Ulrich, rude of speech and of little talent, who among the poets that lived during this most illustrious age of our literature in no way excelled.)

Gruhn easily refuted this view by remarking that imitation of lesser poets by greater ones is historically well documented.[44]

It was then similarly argued that, because Ulrich had imitated his "predecessors" Hartmann and Wolfram, he must have lacked talent. Pérennec makes reference to such "illogisme" in his thesis:

> "Quand il s'agit ensuite de porter un jugement sur la valeur littéraire du roman, la méthode employée n'apparaît pas plus satisfaisante. Etudier le Lanzelet en fonction d'Erec et Parzival conduit à porter une appréciation esthétique qui n'est qu'une pétition de principe: le Lanzelet sera un roman d'épigone, par exemple, mais comment pourrait-on arriver à une conclusion différente quand on se demande ce qui dans le Lanzelet ressemble à Erec et à Parzival? On tourne ainsi en cercle: on ne songe pas à étudier le Lanzelet pour lui-même parce que le roman semble médiocre. Comme on le considère alors en fonction d'autres oeuvres, on en fait une production marquée du sceau de la décadence."[45]

In this discussion of the Lanzelet's originality consideration must also be given to the fact that in the Middle Ages originality did not merit the praise which the modern world accords it and borrowing was not yet considered a reprehensible practice. As Lofmark so astutely observes:

> "Die höfischen Dichter selbst vertreten eine Haltung, die derjenigen unserer Zeit fast entgegengesetzt ist. Wenn sie von ihrer Arbeit oder von der Arbeit ihrer Kollegen sprechen, rühmen sie wohl Sprache und Verskunst, aber sie sagen nichts von einer schöpferischen Neugestaltung des Stoffes, und sie nennen immer wieder als ihre eigentliche Aufgabe das treue Übersetzen der Vorlage, bei dem nichts Bedeutendes ausgelassen und nichts Eigenes eingefügt wird."[46]

Thus even if a medieval author frequently quoted another's works or borrowed motifs and characters from another, as Wolfram frequently did, this is insufficient reason to spurn him as an epigon or hack writer.

Nevertheless Ulrich von Zatzikhoven is so designated and it is the previously described circular reasoning of literary critics which is at fault; yet Pérennec's attempt to divorce the debate over the Lanzelet's

date of composition from an evaluation of the Lanzelet's artistic merit[47] is equally misguided. While it is true that an evaluation of a certain author's talent contributes nothing towards establishing the date of composition of his works relative to those of his contemporaries, the converse does not apply. When an author pioneers a new art form such as the Arthurian epic, even if his work is somewhat crude and unpolished, he is to be highly esteemed. On the other hand, the same crude, unpolished work, if simply an imitation of then popular literature, should be judged inferior because the author in this case, having imitated his predecessors, has learned nothing from them. Thus a later work must equal or in some way surpass previous works composed in the same genre and/or style in order to be worthy of acclaim, whereas an author who reveals great originality in pioneering a new art form is deserving of recognition for this reason alone, even if, as in the case of most medieval German authors, his work is "merely" a translation or adaptation of extant French literature.

It is thus evident that the discussion of the relative chronology of the Arthurian epic is linked to the debate over the Lanzelet's literary value, the outcome of which depends in part on the critic's conception of the moral or spiritual values communicated by Ulrich's work, which is in turn strongly influenced by the researcher's perception of the Lanzelet as a haphazard compilation of borrowed motifs or as a well-structured Erziehungsroman. This thesis will therefore attempt to determine the nature of Ulrich's alleged French source and establish the position of this source and of the Lanzelet within the relative chronology of the Arthurian epic, will briefly analyse the structure of the Lanzelet, and will then utilise the knowledge gained from this research to re-evaluate the merits of the Lanzelet and its French source as works of literature.

Notes

1 Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang. 1170-1250, Vol. II of Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, ed. Helmut de Boor and Richard Newald, 10th ed. (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1979), p. 85.

2 Karl Otto Brogsitter, Artusepik, Sammlung Metzler, 38 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1965), p. 76.

3 Hugo Kuhn, "Die Klassik des Rittertums in der Stauferzeit: 1170-1230", in Annalen der deutschen Literatur, ed. Heinz Otto Burger, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971), p. 135.

4 Stefan Hofer, "Der 'Lanzelet' des Ulrich von Zazikhoven und seine französische Quelle," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 75 (1959), 35.

5 Felix Franz Hofstäter, trans., Lanzelot de Lac, by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, Part I of Altdeutsche Gedichte aus den Zeiten der Tafelrunde (Vienna: C. Schaumburg, 1811) p. xliv.

6 Karl Goedeke, ed., Deutsche Dichtung im Mittelalter (Hanover: L. Ehlermann, 1854), p. 723.

7 Karl Lachmann, joint ed., Iwein, by Hartmann von Aue, ed. G.F. Benecke, 2nd ed. (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1843), p. 316, note to 1.4431.

8 Wilhelm Grimm, ed., Athis und Prophilias (Berlin: Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1846), p. 11, as quoted in Franz Pfeiffer, rev. of Grundrisz zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung, by Karl Goedeke, Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, NS 2 (1857), 497.

9 Franz Pfeiffer, Freie Forschung. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur und Sprache (Vienna: Tendler, 1867), p. 416.

10 Moriz Haupt, rev. of Lanzelet. Eine Erzählung von Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, ed. by K.A. Hahn, Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik, Nos. 14, 15 (July 1845), col. 117.

11 Oskar Jänicke, rev. of Freie Forschung. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur und Sprache, by Franz Pfeiffer, Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen, NS 2 (1868), 301, 302.

12 Jakob Bächtold, Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, Diss. Frauenfeld 1870 (Frauenfeld: J. Huber, 1870), pp. 18-20, 38-41.

13 Jakob Bächtold, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven," Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, NS 19 (1874), 424-426.

14 Johann Christoph Adelung, "Chronologisches Verzeichnis der Dichter und Gedichte aus dem Schwäbischen Zeitpuncte," Magazin für die deutsche Sprache, 2, Stuck 3 (1784), 11.

15 Hofstäter, pp. xxv, xxxix, xl.

16 C. Fauriel, "Lancelot du Lac," Histoire littéraire de la France (Paris, 1852; rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1971), XXII, 214, 215.

17 Bächtold, Der Lanzelet, pp. 46, 50.

18 F. Raynouard, Choix des poésies originales des troubadours (Paris, 1816-1821; rpt. Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1966), II, 318.

19 Gaston Paris, "Ulrich de Zazikhoven et Arnaud Daniel," Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes, 26 (1865), 251-253.

20 Jessie L. Weston, The Legend of Sir Lancelot du Lac: Studies upon its Origin, Development, and Position in the Arthurian Romantic Cycle (London: David Nutt, 1901), pp. 18-20.

21 Kenneth G.T. Webster, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Welschez Buoch,'" Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, 16 (1934), 203-228.

22 Samuel Singer, rev. of The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the Year 1300, by James Douglas Bruce, Litteris, 3, No. 2 (Sept. 1926), 126, 127.

23 Wendelin Förster, Kristian von Troyes; Wörterbuch zu seinen sämtlichen Werken. (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1914), p. 113.

24 Wolfgang Golther, rev. of Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre), ed. by Wendelin Förster, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 22 (1900), II, 2, 3.

25 James Douglas Bruce, The Evolution of the Arthurian Romance From the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300, 2nd ed. (1928; rpt. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958), I, 210.

26 Stefan Hofer, Chrétien de Troyes: Leben und Werke des altfranzösischen Epikers (Graz: Böhlau, 1954), pp. 147, 148.

27 René Pérennec, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Lanzelet. Traduction en francais moderne. Accompagnée d'une introduction et de notes," Diss. Université de Paris 1970, II, 1.

28 Ibid., p. 2.

29 G.G. Gervinus, Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Deutschen. Erster Theil. Von den ersten Spuren der deutschen Dichtung bis gegen das Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts, Vol. I of Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung, Vol. II of Historische Schriften, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1840), p. 258.

30 Ibid., pp. 261, 262.

31 Karl A Hahn, ed., Lanzelet, by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven (Frankfurt a.M., 1845; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965), pp. v, ix-xii.

32 Bächtold, Der Lanzelet, p. 33.

33 Adolf Behre, "Die Kunst der Personenschilderung bei Ulrich von Zatzikhoven," Diss. Greifswald 1913, pp. 9, 10.

34 Augustus Vilmar, Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur, 20th ed. (Marburg: Elwert, 1881), pp. 135, 372.

35 Friedrich Vogt, "Mittelhochdeutsche Literatur," in Literaturgeschichte, Vol. II, Part I of Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, ed. Hermann Paul, 2nd ed. (Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1901-1909), p. 195.

36 Gustav Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters (Munich: Beck, 1935), II, Part II, 6.

37 Ibid., p. 7.

38 Gerhard Eis, "Ulrich von Zazikhoven," Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon, 1953 ed., IV, cols. 622-624.

39 M. O'C. Walshe, Medieval German literature: a survey (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 176.

40 Ernst Soudek, "Die Funktion der Namensuche und der Zweikämpfe in Ulrich von Zatzikhovens 'Lanzelet,'" Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik, 2 (1972), 173.

41 Klaus M. Schmidt, "Frauenritter oder Artusritter? Über Struktur und Gehalt von Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven 'Lanzelet,'" Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 98 (1979), 1.

42 Max Wehrli, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur vom frühen Mittelalter bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts, Vol. I of Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1980), p. 296.

43 Georgius Nicolaus Schilling, "De Usu dicendi Ulrici de Zatzikhoven," Diss. Halle 1866, p. 6.

44 Albert Gruhn, "Erek und Lanzelet," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 43 (1899), 272.

45 Pérennec, p. 3.

46 Carl Lofmark, "Der höfische Dichter als Übersetzer," in Probleme mittelhochdeutscher Erzählformen; Marburger Colloquium 1969, ed. Peter Ganz and Werner Schröder (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1972), p. 40.

47 Pérennec, pp. 26, 27.

II. The Lanzelet and its French Source

A. The Existence of Ulrich's Source

Like many other medieval German authors Ulrich von Zatzikhoven claims that his work is a faithful translation of a foreign source, presumably French, which he describes as a "welschez buoch." Unfortunately, no such medieval "welschez buoch" corresponding to the Lanzelet has survived the ravages of time, and one might therefore be tempted to dismiss Ulrich's statement as literary fiction if he had not in his epic described in some detail the circumstances leading to his acquisition of this source:

> diz selbe getihte.
> als ich iuch berihte,
> so enist dâ von noch zuo geleit,
> wan als ein welschez buoch seit,
> daz uns von êrst wart erkant,
> dô der künic von Engellant
> wart gevangen, als got wolde,
> von dem herzogen Liupolde,
> und er in höhe schatzte.
> der gevangen künec im satzte
> ze gîseln edel herren,
> von vremden landen verren,
> an gebürte harte grôz,
> grâven, vrîen and und der gnôz:
> di bevalch ab keiser Heinrich
> in tiutschiu lant umbe sich,
> als im riet sîn wille.
> Hûc von Morville
> hiez der selben gîsel ein,
> in des gewalt uns vor erschein
> daz welsche buoch von Lanzelete. (Lanz. v. 9321-9341)[1]

The allusion to Hugh de Morville as one of the hostages exchanged for the release of King Richard the Lion-Hearted lends credence to the author's comments about the origin of the Lanzelet; firstly because the existence of an Anglo-Norman nobleman named Hugh de Morville who was King Richard's contemporary is well attested in historical documents, although he is never explicitly identified elsewhere as one of the hostages,[2] and,

secondly, because the Arthurian names employed by Ulrich in the Lanzelet are recorded in forms consistent with the Anglo-Norman dialect of Old French.[3]

Moreover, the comparison of episodes and motifs in the Lanzelet with those in other medieval treatments of the Lancelot legend reveal striking parallels which indicate that Ulrich did not simply invent his material or borrow it haphazardly from other Arthurian epics. Since the French Prose Lancelot shares several episodes and motifs with the Lanzelet, such as the account of the hero's youth, which are lacking in other early Lancelot epics the former works must, as Mărtens suggested, in some way be related.[4] Yet because the Lanzelet was composed before the French Prose Lancelot, which was compiled during the first three decades of the thirteenth century,[5] the latter could not have furnished the source material for the former. Conversely, because German authors appear to have exercised little or no influence on their French counterparts during this era, Ulrich's work has never been postulated as the source of the related episodes in the French Prose Lancelot. Thus Mărtens' discovery of numerous correspondences between these two works proves that the Lanzelet and some sections of the French Prose Lancelot were ultimately derived from a common source,[6] possibly Hugh de Morville's "welschez buoch," generally referred to as the Urlanzelet, for, as Webster has demonstrated, Ulrich's frequent allusions to the derivation of his material from a "welschez buoch" or "lied" are confirmed as true by the fact that the episodes in the Lanzelet where Ulrich makes such comments almost invariably have analogues in the French Prose Lancelot and/or in Chrétien's Chevalier de la Charrette (CdlC), indicating that the Lancelot legend had already been recorded in a French epic long before Ulrich penned his Lanzelet.[7]

B. The Nature of Ulrich's Source

Not surprisingly, no sooner was the question of the existence of this Urlanzelet satisfactorily settled than a controversy arose vis-à-vis the nature of Ulrich's source. Many scholars, among them James Bruce,[8] Stefan Hofer,[9] and Kurt Ruh,[10] believe that Ulrich's source was an inept compilation of episodes and motifs borrowed from several of Chrétien's epics. A number of these critics also maintain, like Golther, that:

> "Da der unbekannte Verfasser (i.e. of Ulrich's source) Kristians Werke gelegentlich ausplündert, so war ihm vermutlich auch der Karrenroman vor Augen, obschon er die Zuthaten Kristians zur Entführungsgeschichte streicht. Mir scheint dieser schlecht angelegte Lanceletroman (i.e. Urlanzelet) geradezu eine Ergänzung zur Karre."[11]

However, other scholars such as Jessie Weston[12] and Samuel Singer[13] hotly contest the view that Chrétien's works comprised the source of the Urlanzelet and postulate instead that the Urlanzelet originated when a number of lays based on Celtic legend were strung together to create one of the first primitive Arthurian romances. A final verdict as to the merits of these conflicting theories can only be reached by ascertaining the relationship of the Urlanzelet to Chrétien's epics and to certain Celtic tales through a comparative analysis of the episodes and motifs they share with one another - if an episode in the Lanzelet parallels an episode in one of these works or a Celtic tale more closely (by sharing subsidiary motifs with it) than it does a similar Celtic tale or an episode in another work, then it should follow that the latter work or tale is less closely related to the Urlanzelet than the former and, given the relative date of composition of a few of these works, it should then be possible to identify the various stages in the evolution of the Lancelot legend which the individual epics and tales represent.

C. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Epics

Since the theory that Ulrich's source was nothing but a pastiche of episodes and motifs borrowed from a variety of Chrétien's epics, not only from the CdlC,[14] seems to be most popular among Germanists and has recently been espoused by no less an authority than Kurt Ruh[15] it will be the first to be subjected to closer scrutiny. Proponents of this view base their theory on the fact that numerous episodes in the Lanzelet apparently have analogues in Chrétien's Erec, Cligès, Ivain and Perceval as well as in the CdlC.[16] It is simply assumed by these scholars that the presence of such parallels must be due to borrowing from Chrétien's works by the author of the Urlanzelet.

1. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Perceval

Bruce, for example, claims that the anonymity of the hero in the Lanzelet is a feature ultimately derived from Chrétien's Perceval.[17] Yet in Chrétien's version of the Perceval legend this motif fulfils no significant function in the development of the plot; it is merely a superfluous aspect of the hero's tumpheit. This contrasts markedly with the prominence of the same motif in the Lanzelet where, as Soudek has shown,[18] the hero's namelessness is central to the development of the story and furnishes an essential link between the diverse adventures of the hero which lead up to his encounter with Iweret. Moreover, by tying the hero's discovery of his name to the accomplishment of a particular adventure or feat of arms, the Lanzelet differs significantly from Chrétien's Perceval but conforms closely to stories of the "Bel Inconnu" type (with which it also corresponds in other respects),[19] which probably retain a more archaic version of the motif than Chrétien's Perceval does.

It therefore comes as a surprise when critics identify the author of the Urlanzelet as the borrower, for it is inconceivable that a skilled author like Chrétien, if he truly was composing an original epic independent of any source, should frequently utilise motifs which apparently have no symbolic value and do nothing to further the plot or contribute to the structure of his work. It is far more likely that the appearance of dead motifs in an epic is the result of deliberate, extensive adaptation of a source, an adaptation which would probably lead to a restructuring of the epic and to the omission or re-arrangement of some motifs and episodes and/or the addition of others from foreign sources. Such modifications could conceivably produce occasional inconsistencies in the development of the plot, might leave the action poorly motivated in parts of the revised epic, and would frequently deprive motifs of the function and significance they had had in their original context. Thus if the author failed to entirely omit such motifs from his epic, yet did not succeed in completely integrating them in his adaptation of the hypothetical source by inventing a new function for them as structural or symbolic elements in their new context, his borrowing could easily be detected. Consequently, if this parallel between the Lanzelet and Perceval is to be ascribed to borrowing, then the evidence points to Chrétien as the borrower.

On the other hand, the motif of the hero's anonymity is not restricted to these two epics but is also utilised by Chrétien in the CdlC (which was composed before Perceval) where it is not a dead motif, but serves to create suspense and contributes to the aura of mystery surrounding the hero. Thus this theme in the Urlanzelet, if it was indeed borrowed from one of Chrétien's epics, which seems rather unlikely, was probably adapted from the CdlC rather than from Perceval.

This same objection can also be raised against the suggestion that the Galagandreiz episode in the Lanzelet was ultimately derived from the Blancheflor episode in Perceval,[20] for while it is true that the actions of Galagandreiz' lascivious daughter parallel those of Blancheflor, they also resemble those of one of the damsels depicted in the CdlC. Therefore this episode of the Lanzelet, too, could ultimately have been derived from the CdlC.

Yet another feature of the Lanzelet which some scholars questionably attribute to borrowing from Chrétien's Perceval by the author of the Urlanzelet is the account of the hero's youth and education, particularly with regard to the Dümmlingssage,[21] and this in spite of the fact that other scholars such as Brugger[22] and Philipot[23] have deemed the "enfances féeriques" of the Lanzelet more archaic than the prosaic "enfances humaines" of Perceval and Parzival. Moreover, when the two accounts are subjected to close scrutiny, it soon becomes apparent that the differences outweigh the similarities. True, the hero is in each case an ignorant youth who has been raised apart from the world, whose father has died in battle, and who is untrained in the chivalrous pursuit of jousting, but the two epics contrast sharply in their depiction of the hero's youth where details are concerned. Perceval is an accomplished horseman while Lancelot is completely ignorant of equestrian pursuits. Perceval is brought up in a mundane forest by his mother and her servants, whereas Lancelot, much like the hero of the French Prose Lancelot and of the CdlC (v. 2354 ff.), is raised by a fairy on an island in a lake, a locale which corresponds to descriptions of the otherworld in old Celtic legends.[24] Lancelot's foster mother provides him with proper armor and weapons whereas Perceval's mother dresses her son in the costume of a boor. Perceval is instructed in the art of jousting by an elderly knight, while

Lancelot is taught how to ride and how to hold his lance and shield by a young cavalier. Thus the alleged parallels between Perceval and the Lanzelet in their depiction of the hero's youth and education are either restricted to generalities and stock motifs or are shared by the CdlC and Prose Lancelot as well and need not be attributed to borrowing from Perceval by the author of the Urlanzelet since it is equally possible that Chrétien borrowed these motifs from the latter work or that the two authors independently drew on traditional material. Cosman, after all, points out that Ulrich's account of Lancelot's enfances corresponds more closely to Wolfram's description of Parzival's youth and education than to Chrétien's version of the tale.[25] Similarly, Loomis lists several parallels between Lancelot's education as recounted in the Lanzelet and the instruction which the hero of Peredur receives from one of the sorceresses of the "Shining Castle," Caer Loyw, which itself resembles Ulrich's "Meidelant."[26]

In addition, some portions of the Lanzelet which have no analogues whatsoever in Chrétien's Perceval nevertheless correspond closely to episodes in other versions of the Perceval legend. For example, in one episode in Peredur the hero is first imprisoned by his host and then succored by his jailer's daughter, who provides him with the necessities of life in his cell and eventually releases him so that he can attend a tournament from which he returns victorious.[27] The jailer's daughter in Peredur is, of course, reminiscent of Ade and the queen of Pluris in the Lanzelet and of the seneschal's wife and Meleagant's sister in the CdlC but has no counterpart in Chrétien's Perceval.

Similarly, the Queen of Pluris with her hundred knights, who appears in Ulrich's epic, has an analogue both in the Empress of Constantinople, also accompanied by a hundred knights, in Peredur[28] and in Herzeloyde in

Wolfram's Parzival. All three works describe how a hero unintentionally and somewhat reluctantly wins the hand of a queen by defeating all opponents in a tournament which he has entered without such a "marriage" as his goal. This episode, too, is lacking in Chrétien's Perceval epic.

Meanwhile Ulrich's work also parallels Peredur[29] and Parzival in that the respective heroes each win the love of three women in succession. Yet whereas Wolfram, for one, depicts Parzival's amorous encounters with three different ladies (Jeschute, Liaze, Condwiramurs),[30] Chrétien limits his hero to only two such adventures in Perceval, where no counterpart to Liaze appears.

Thus it would seem that not the Urlanzelet and Perceval but rather the entire Lancelot and Perceval legends are somehow related,[31] although one could object that the many parallels between Peredur, Parzival, the CdlC, and the Lanzelet could conceivably be attributed to borrowing from the latter two and/or the Urlanzelet by the authors of Peredur and Parzival or to borrowing from Parzival by Ulrich. However, because the episodes in question diverge considerably in their depiction of details and appear in entirely different contexts within the diverse works, these similarities cannot all be ascribed to borrowing, particularly where the Lanzelet, Parzival, and Peredur all parallel each other to the exclusion of Chrétien's Perceval. Therefore it could well be that at an early stage in the development of the Lancelot and Perceval legends adventures originally associated with one particular hero came to be attributed to a different hero altogether.

On the other hand, even if one accepts the possibility that parallels between the different works mentioned are the result of borrowing, this is still no basis for assuming, as so many critics do, that episodes and

motifs common to Ulrich's epic and Chrétien's Perceval must have been copied from the latter by the author of the Urlanzelet. As the examples cited have made clear, in a large number of cases alleged correspondences between the Lanzelet and various versions of the Perceval legend are shared with the CdlC as well. Therefore, since the Urlanzelet and the CdlC are already closely linked in that they are both Lancelot epics, it follows that the author of the Urlanzelet, if he did indeed mine Chrétien's epics for material, would have exploited the CdlC rather than Perceval. Meanwhile, parallels between portions of Perceval and the Lanzelet or the CdlC could be explained as the results of borrowing from the CdlC or the Urlanzelet by Chrétien when he was in the process of composing his last epic. In any case, no real evidence can be advanced to support the contention that Chrétien's Perceval furnished the ultimate source for some of the episodes in Ulrich's Lanzelet.

2. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Ivain

Another of Chrétien's epics which supposedly furnished the author of the Urlanzelet with material for his work is Ivain. Many critics have been struck by the parallels between the fountain episode in Ivain and the Iweret episode in the Lanzelet. Förster, for example, notes that in both epics the hero fights a duel to the death with a close relative of the woman he eventually marries. Moreover, the two accounts correspond with each other in the description of the field of combat as well, which in both cases consists of a typical locus amoenus complete with a bubbling spring overshadowed by an evergreen tree and situated in a forest glade in a realm of magic.[32] These similarities lead Bruce to claim that the scene in the Lanzelet is merely an echo of the fountain episode in Ivain.[33]

Nevertheless, further consideration soon reveals that the Iweret episode in Ulrich's work could not have been originally derived from Ivain. Even Förster, who was one of the first to remark upon the similarities between the two accounts and who believed that Chrétien's Ivain antedated the Urlanzelet,[34] later rejected the possibility that the fountain episode in Ivain furnished the ultimate source of the parallel episode in Ulrich's epic.[35] For one thing, although the fountain in Ivain is a storm-making spring, the fountain in the Lanzelet evinces no supernatural properties whatsoever. This discrepancy is very important, for it is extremely unlikely that the author of Ulrich's original who delighted in portraying such mirabilia as the "Wachsende warte" (Lanz. v. 5124) and the "Schriende mos" (Lanz. v. 7041) would, for no apparent reason, have deleted the magical character of the spring from the episode if it had been included in his source,[36] for such an allusion to a rain-making spring in the Urlanzelet would have been completely consistent with the author's style and taste. Chrétien, on the other hand, could easily have interpolated this feature in his story after having read about a rain-making spring in Wace,[37] just as he incorporated elements of the Tristan legend in Cligès. Thus stylistic criteria militate against the view that correspondences between the Lanzelet and Ivain can be imputed to borrowing from the latter by the author of the Urlanzelet.

Besides, as Loomis remarks in passing,[38] this episode in the Lanzelet has an analogue not only in Chrétien's Ivain but in the CdlC as well, a fact which seems to have escaped all other scholars, even though comparison of the Iweret episode in the Lanzelet with the closing scene in the CdlC, where Lancelot finally slays his mortal foe, Meleagant, reveals a number of striking similarities. As in Ulrich's epic, the setting for

the knightly combat in the CdlC is a locus amoenus, which Chrétien depicts as follows:

> An la lande un sagremor ot
> Si bel que plus estre ne pot:
> Mout tenoit place, mout iert lez,
> S'est li leus tot an tor orlez
> De menue erbe fresche et bele,
> Qui an toz tanz estoit novele.
> Soz le sagremor jant et bel,
> Qui plantez fu del tans Abel,
> Sort une clere fontenele
> Qui de corre est assez isnele.
> Li graviers est et biaus et janz
> Et clers con se ce fust arjanz,
> Et li tuiaus, si con je cuit,
> De fin or esmeré et cuit,
> Et cort parmi la lande a val,
> Antre deus bois parmi un val. (CdlC, v. 7005-7020)[39]

> In the field there stood a sycamore as fair as any tree could be; it was wide spread and covered a large area, and around it grew a fine border of thick fresh grass which was green at all seasons of the year. Under this fair and stately sycamore, which was planted back in Abel's time, there rises a clear spring of water which flows away hurriedly. The bed of the spring is beautiful and as bright as silver, and the channel through which the water flows is formed, I think, of refined and tested gold, and it stretches away across the field down into a valley between the woods.[40]

Although brief, this description of the field of combat in the CdlC coincides quite closely with the portrayal of Behforet in the Lanzelet. Features common to both accounts include a beautiful tree overshadowing a pleasant fountain of clear water, a beautifully worked basin or conduit which catches the water, the eternal summer which keeps the glade perpetually green, and the forest which is bisected by a stream. Thus, with regard to the setting of the combat, this segment of the CdlC parallels the Iweret episode in Ulrich's epic as closely, if not more so, than does the corresponding portion of Ivain.

Furthermore, the Lanzelet and CdlC resemble each other in the delineation of the combat as well. In both epics the hero and his opponent batter each other with their weapons until their armor is rent

and torn and in both accounts Lancelot wounds his opponent twice before decapitating him. Amazingly, the two accounts even agree in their description of one of the wounds Lancelot metes out. Chrétien relates of the battle:

> Mes Lanceloz bien se porcuide;
> Car a s'espee qui bien taille
> Li a fet tel osche an sa taille,
> Don il ne respassera mes,
> Ainz iert passez avris et mes;
> Que le nasel li hurte as danz,
> Que trois l'an a brisiez dedanz. (CdlC. v. 7096-7102)
>
> ... but Lancelot forestalls his plan, for with his trenchant sword he deals his body such a cut as he will not recover from until April and May be passed. He smashes his nose-guard against his teeth, breaking three of them in his mouth.

Ulrich states:

> des wart der küene Iweret
> geslagen durch sîn barbel,
> daz der degen alsô snel
> bluoten begunde
> zer nasen und zem munde
> durch die vintâlen nider. (Lanz. v. 4528 - 4533)

The parallel is unmistakable; in both versions of the combat Lancelot seriously wounds his opponent with a blow to the area of the mouth and nose. Moreover, in both the Lanzelet and the CdlC the lady on whose behalf the hero is fighting wishes him to spare his enemy, which Lancelot refuses to do. Thus, in this instance, the agreement between the accounts of the battle in the CdlC and in the Lanzelet far outweighs the sparse parallels between the depiction of the combat in the Lanzelet and in Ivain. Consequently, there is no need to postulate the fountain episode in Chrétien's Ivain as the model for the Iweret episode in Ulrich's work because the CdlC furnishes a much more likely source.

3. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Cligès

Yet, in spite of the paucity of the evidence supporting the

hypothesis that the author of the Urlanzelet exploited several of Chrétien's epics for material, critics have persisted in linking certain episodes in the Lanzelet with various scenes in Chrétien's works. Förster[41] and Hofer,[42] for example, also link Ulrich's epic with Cligès, contending that the three days' tournament as it is depicted in Ulrich's work is merely an adaptation of the four days' tournament portrayed in Cligès, since the hero in both accounts attempts to remain anonymous by changing the color of his armor after each day of the tourney and eventually becomes Gawain's friend.

However, both Jessie Weston[43] and Charles Carter,[44] the only critics to undertake an in depth study of the tournament motif, agree that the depiction of the tourney in the Lanzelet is more archaic and closer to the postulated source than the presentation of the same motif in Cligès, for the episode in Cligès is clearly an interpolation. Firstly, Cligès admittedly consists of a compilation of motifs taken from both the matière de Bretagne (e.g. the Tristan legend) and the matière de Rome. Secondly, the hero's habit of changing the color of his armor after each day of the contest, his desire for anonymity, and his need for a horse and weapons are all dead motifs replete with superfluous details in Chrétien's account whereas the same motifs fulfil a vital function in the plot and structure of the Lanzelet where the hero is nameless from the outset and where Lancelot, whose own armor has been destroyed in previous battles, is truly in need of a new suit of armor. Therefore it is more reasonable to assume that Chrétien borrowed the tournament episode from the Urlanzelet and revised it, rather than that the author of the Urlanzelet copied the tourney episode in Cligès.

On the other hand, the three days' tournament motif is also employed by Hue de Rotelande in Ipomedon, another early medieval French Arthurian epic which Bruce considers a possible source of the tournament episode in the Lanzelet,[45] for Ulrich's epic does agree more closely with Ipomedon in the depiction of the tournament than it does with Cligès, firstly because the contest in Ipomedon lasts only three days, as it does in the Lanzelet, rather than four days as recorded in Cligès, secondly, because the hero in both Ipomedon and the Lanzelet is urged to participate in a tournament by a friend but refuses the invitation, only to change his mind and attend the tourney anyway, and thirdly because the hero's squire in the Lanzelet, Diepalt, has an analogue in Jason, the hero's squire in Ipomedon.[46] Yet, as Carter notes, these features of the tourament episode could just as plausibly have been borrowed by Hue de Rotelande from the Urlanzelet.[47]

Moreover, there is some evidence to suggest that the three days' tournament is an integral part of the Lancelot legend since the tourney depicted in the CdlC betrays some similarities to the tournament described in the Lanzelet,[48] similarities which can best be accounted for if one assumes that Chrétien found such an episode in the source of the CdlC but revised it extensively to avoid simply retelling the story of the tournament which he had already related in Cligès.

One important detail which the tournament episode in the CdlC shares with Ulrich's account is the fact that Gawain initially refrains from participating in the jousting and assumes the role of spectator on the first day of the tournament. Also, in contrast to some other versions of the three days' tournament, both the CdlC and the Lanzelet relate how the hero's charger and armor are furnished him by a lady. Other traits common to both Ulrich's epic and the CdlC are Lancelot's attempt to remain

incognito and the generosity with which he permits others to keep the steeds of the knights he has unhorsed. These parallels, taken together, indicate that the Lanzelet and the CdlC drew on a common source in which the tournament episode was already associated with the figure of Lancelot. Thus, for a number of reasons it is unnecessary and irrational to propose that the tournament motif in the Lanzelet was ultimately derived from its counterpart in Chrétien's Cligès.

4. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Erec

The hypothesis that Chrétien's Erec provided the author of the Urlanzelet with some of his material[49] is subject to much the same flaws as the previously discussed theories. While it is true that both the Lanzelet and Chrétien's Erec contain a rude dwarf episode and that both epics recount how a mounted dwarf strikes the hero with a whip without good cause, the circumstances under which this occurs are quite different. In Chrétien's work neither the hero nor the dwarf are alone and the hero immediately sets out to avenge himself after being insulted by the dwarf whereas in the Lanzelet both the hero and the dwarf are unaccompanied and the former only seeks revenge after a considerable period of time has elapsed. Moreover, the setting of the adventure; a castle on the one hand, a dark forest on the other, is completely different in the two epics.

Also significant is the fact that a rude dwarf episode appears in the CdlC as well. Indeed, there are two such episodes in Chrétien's Lancelot epic. In the first of these Lancelot, in order to discover the whereabouts of the abducted queen, is constrained to ride in a cart driven by a mysterious rude dwarf. In the second such episode a mounted dwarf bearing a whip and acting as a messenger treacherously leads the hero into an ambush. Interestingly, this second adventure with an insolent dwarf

forms the prelude to the amorous jaileress episode in the CdlC, just as the hero's encounter with the rude dwarf in the Lanzelet eventually results in his imprisonment at Pluris. In both epics Lancelot is lured into captivity by a mounted dwarf carrying a whip but is later permitted to leave his prison and is provided with arms and a horse by his enamored jaileress so that he can participate in some sort of tourney. Both works also relate how the hero gains his freedom by slyly making a promise which is so formulated that he can violate its intent while not literally breaking his word. Finally, the two epics also agree in making the hero the object of a search by other Arthurian knights.[50] Thus once again a section of the Lanzelet which was supposedly derived from one of Chrétien's other epics betrays a marked similarity to an episode in the CdlC as well and could therefore have been based on the latter if it was indeed borrowed from Chrétien.

By contrast, the stag hunt episode in Chrétien's Erec could very well have inspired the reference to the hunting of the white stag in Ulrich's work since the two epics coincide remarkably well in their comments about the hunt. For example, both Chrétien and Ulrich state that the quarry is a white stag and that it is hunted by King Arthur and his knights. Furthermore, the two authors agree that at the conclusion of the hunt King Arthur is required by custom to kiss the fairest lady of the court and imply that this tradition, handed down by Uther Pendragon, Arthur's father, tends to cause jealousy and dissension among the courtiers.[51] Thus, since the two accounts of the stag hunt agree even in details, this motif may indeed have been excerpted from Chrétien's Erec by the author of the Urlanzelet, although the converse could also be true.

Nevertheless, where motifs in the Lanzelet could ultimately have been derived from one of Chrétien's epics (exclusive of the CdlC) or where such derivation is merely postulated, the motifs in question are always well integrated in the plot and structure of Ulrich's epic. The rude dwarf episode in the Lanzelet, for example, is alluded to frequently as the prelude to the adventure at Pluris and thereby furnishes one of the threads which binds together the numerous episodes in the first half of Ulrich's epic. Similarly, the stag hunt episode performs an important function in the development of the plot in the Lanzelet in that it sets the stage for Guinevere's abduction by Valerin. This contrasts markedly with the somewhat forced combination of the same motifs in Chrétien's Erec, where the conjunction of the rude dwarf and stag hunt motifs represents a revision of the original legend[52] and where the actions of the characters are poorly motivated. Thus in those instances where the author of the Urlanzelet is alleged to have taken material from Chrétien's epics other than the CdlC, it appears that he actually improved on his source, if he did indeed borrow from Chrétien's works, and consequently cannot be relegated to the status of an epigon or an inept imitator of a celebrated predecessor.

5. The Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Chevalier de la Charrette

However, as has been demonstrated, in total very little evidence can be adduced in support of the view that the Urlanzelet was a patchwork of episodes and motifs borrowed from the whole range of Chrétien's epics even if one assumes that the Urlanzelet was composed after Chrétien had concluded his literary career, an assumption which has never been proven and is probably unwarranted. On the other hand there is good reason to suppose a closer relationship between the Urlanzelet and Chrétien's CdlC,

not only because both works are Lancelot epics, but also because Ulrich's work, which is purportedly a faithful translation of the Urlanzelet, teems with motifs which have close analogues in the CdlC. In fact, Holmes even went so far as to postulate that Chrétien's Lancelot epic was the sole source of the Lanzelet,[53] a view justly rejected by the vast majority of critics[54] because these two epics differ markedly in their plot, structure, and presentation whereas the Lanzelet is purportedly a faithful translation of its source.

By contrast, Golther's suggestion that it was the Urlanzelet which was based on the CdlC[55] is much more plausible since the wealth of correspondences between the Lanzelet and Chrétien's Lancelot epic indicates that Ulrich's source and the latter were closely related. Indeed, although attention has already been drawn to a number of the parallels between Ulrich's work and the CdlC, such as the parallel between the seneschal's wife in the amorous jaileress episode in the CdlC and the queen of Pluris in the Lanzelet or the correspondence between the character of Ade in the Lanzelet and her counterpart in the CdlC, Meleagant's sister, who, like Ade, feeds Lancelot while he is imprisoned by one of her relatives, nurses him back to health after she has secured his release, and becomes his amie in spite of the fact that her relative is Lancelot's mortal foe and is doomed to die at his hand,[56] many others exist which are just as striking and which incontrovertibly demonstrate that the Urlanzelet and the CdlC are somehow related.

The Galagandreiz episode in the Lanzelet, for example, has much in common with the perilous bed episode in the CdlC,[57] as the following summary of features shared by the two accounts reveals. After an incident in which Lancelot has been embarassed in an encounter with a rude dwarf he

arrives at a castle where he seeks and obtains lodging for the night. He is accompanied by at least one Arthurian knight who is a proven hero. His companion(s) is/are welcomed and favored by their hostess while Lancelot is in some way insulted or belittled by her. The latter, attended by two damsels, shows the guests to their beds or visits them after they have retired for the night and informs them of a perilous adventure which the proven hero(es) decline(s) to attempt but which Lancelot dares. The latter, who occupies the last in a series of three beds, suffers a slight wound from a cast weapon while accomplishing the adventure. Finally, before Lancelot departs from the castle his grateful hostess bestows some mark of favor on him.

In addition, it is noteworthy that, although Galagandreiz' promiscuous daughter has no exact counterpart in the perilous bed episode of the CdlC, she does correspond closely to the lascivious damsel depicted in the succeeding episode of Chrétien's Lancelot epic.[58] Interestingly, the Galagandreiz episode in the Lanzelet concludes with the hero of the epic coming to a crossroads after having left the castle, just as does the parallel episode in the CdlC.

Elsewhere in the two epics similarities are also apparent. In one instance the authors of both works digress in order to comment on the safety of damsels riding unescorted through the countryside,[59] while at another point both authors allude to a magical ring bestowed on the hero by his fairy foster mother. The two epicists also coincide in their inclusion in their respective works of an episode in which the hero, during his journey to succor Queen Guinevere, defeats a lone knight in a joust at a ford and knocks him into the water. Meanwhile both Ulrich and Chrétien depict Lancelot's visit to a cemetery where he encounters a

talkative old monk who points out to the hero the grave or tomb which is allegedly destined for him.[60] Moreover, the tale of the abduction and rescue of Queen Guinevere and of Lancelot's duel with her abductor is recounted not only in the CdlC, but in the Lanzelet as well. Thus Ulrich's epic and the CdlC frequently concur not only in their relation of seemingly inconsequential details but also in their delineation and sequencing of some events in the plot.

However, these parallels between the CdlC and the Lanzelet do not in themselves prove that Golther was correct in his assumption that the Urlanzelet was based on Chrétien's epic, for it must be noted that correspondences between the Urlanzelet and the CdlC could be accounted for in several different ways. One could postulate, as Golther originally did, that the Urlanzelet was based on Chrétien's Lancelot epic,[61] but one could also theorize that the CdlC was derived from the Urlanzelet instead or that both works comprised independent adaptations of a common source. Nevertheless Golther,[62] along with his adherent Hofer,[63] simply assumes without producing viable evidence in support of his claim, that the author of the Urlanzelet imitated Chrétien, rather than vice versa, and concludes that the author of Ulrich's source was an epigon.

This latter conclusion is, however, demonstrably false, for the plot, style, and structure of the CdlC as a whole differ so drastically from those of Ulrich's work (which most scholars consider to be a faithful translation of the Urlanzelet) that, in spite of the similarity of material utilised by the two authors, Ulrich's source can in no way be designated a mere imitation or adaptation of Chrétien's Lancelot epic. Indeed, even where the motifs employed by these epicists are concerned, differences abound. The motif of the cart, for example, which plays a

major role in Chrétien's poem, is conspicuously absent in the Lanzelet. Similarly the main theme of the CdlC, the hero's love affair with Queen Guinevere, is not even hinted at in the Lanzelet, where the hero's amorous adventures are of an entirely different order.[64] Conversely, much of the material in Ulrich's work, including the adventure with the dragon, the Malduc episode, and the account of the Mantelprobe, is missing in the CdlC. Thus many of the salient features of the one epic are totally lacking in the other.

Consequently, if one persists in the belief that the Urlanzelet was inspired by the CdlC, then one must assume that the author of the former deliberately re-organized the raw material he discovered in the CdlC, deleting some episodes and motifs and adding others in order to propound an ideology of love completely at variance with the philosophy of hohe Minne advocated by Chrétien and thereby change the whole thrust of the Lancelot legend. Yet once this is admitted, then the Urlanzelet can no longer be termed an imitation, adaptation or completion of Chrétien's epic but must instead be recognized as a literary masterpiece that ingeniously parodies the CdlC. Only this possibility, that the Urlanzelet comprised an Anti-Chevalier, suffices to explain why the motifs of the cart and the sword bridge and the theme of Lancelot's illicit love for the queen are lacking in the Lanzelet, for it is unthinkable that one of Chrétien's successors should otherwise have totally removed from the story of Lancelot the very themes and motifs which became the hallmarks of the Lancelot legend and were most frequently alluded to by his successors.

Yet this explanation for the far-reaching differences which separate the Lanzelet and the CdlC is unsatisfactory as well, for it fails to account for the discrepancies in style and structure between Ulrich's epic

and Chrétien's romance. For example, the treatment of love in the Lanzelet, which contrasts sharply with the depiction of hohe Minne in the CdlC, is much more appropriate to pre-courtly literature than to the work of an epigon. Likewise, the simple narrative style of the Lanzelet clashes with the florid hyperbole of the CdlC which typifies courtly literature. Then, too, the Lanzelet in no way conforms in structure to its counterpart the CdlC. However, the most important objection to Golther's theory that the Urlanzelet was based on the CdlC is the fact that proponents of a third theory have amassed evidence which indicates that Ulrich's source probably antedated the CdlC and therefore could not have been derived from the latter. Thus Golther's proposal is ultimately no more viable than was the suggestion that the Urlanzelet consisted of nothing but a pastiche of borrowed motifs.

D. The Sources of the Urlanzelet and of Chrétien's CdlC

The third theory just referred to, although less popular among critics than the others, nevertheless offers the best prospect for a solution to the riddle of the evolution of the Urlanzelet in that it postulates that the latter resulted from a compilation of related lays based on Celtic legends, i.e. a lay cycle. Indeed, most scholars are willing to accept that medieval French Arthurian romance is at least indirectly derived from Celtic sources, but frequently ascribe to Chrétien the honor of first having gathered this material and molded it into Arthurian romances, thus assigning to all other authors of medieval Arthurian epics the role of Chrétien's successors and emulators rather than ascribing to any of them the status of his contemporaries and equals.

That this attitude is unjustified becomes manifest once the central episode of the CdlC, the abduction and rescue of Queen Guinevere, is

compared with its counterparts in the Lanzelet and in Celtic literature, for such a comparison reveals that the account in the Lanzelet (and thus presumably in the Urlanzelet) is in several respects more archaic than Chrétien's rendition of the abduction tale. In fact the parallels which exist between the different versions of the abduction story can be utilised to delineate the literary evolution of the tale and thereby prove that the Urlanzelet could not have been derived from the CdlC (the controversial sculpture of the Modena archivolt merely serves to corroborate the literary evidence),[65] as will be demonstrated in the succeeding paragraphs.

Probably the oldest variant of the abduction episode is found in the Irish Tochmarc Etain (Wooing of Etain), a tale composed prior to the mid-twelfth century which Webster summarizes as follows:

> Etain was the favorite wife of the fairy king Mider. An envious rival transformed her into a fly and blew her over Ireland till she fell into the cup of a certain mortal queen. In due time she was born as the daughter of this queen; and by and by Eochaid Airem, supreme king of Ireland, married her. Her old husband Mider came a-wooing her and tempting her with songs and claims of previous rights to return to his kingdom; but she would not - not without her husband's consent. So Mider appeared one day to King Airem and proposed a game of chess for any stakes the victor chose. He let Airem win and had to perform a prodigious task. Then Mider proposed a second game with the same stakes. This time Mider won and demanded the queen. "Come again in a month," said Airem. Mider did, appearing suddenly in the midst of the warriors set to guard the queen. He spirited her away from them to his fairy mound of Bri Leith. Airem with his army could not recover her. He told his druid to get her back. A year the druid sought, and at last by his ogams and yew-twigs he discovered that she was in the mound. They destroyed the mound and regained the queen.[66]

Another archaic version of the abduction tale is found in the mid-twelfth century Latin Vita Gildae written by Caradoc of Llancarvan, who based his work on Celtic legend. Webster's summary of Caradoc's account of Guinevere's abduction reads as follows:

> ... Melwas, ruler of Aestiva Regio or Somerset, violently captured Guinevere and took her to Glastonbury, a place strong on account of the surrounding marshes. Arthur, after searching a year, brought the armies of Cornwall and Devon thither to rescue her; but the Abbot of Glastonbury and St. Gildas reconciled the two monarchs, persuading Melwas to give back the queen peaceably. Both Melwas and Arthur, in a proper spirit of gratitude, presented lands to the abbey.[67]

When these two versions of the abduction tale are now juxtaposed with each other and with the abduction episodes in the Lanzelet and CdlC, the comparison yields some interesting results. Firstly, it is apparent that of all the works in question, it is the Lanzelet which most closely resembles the Wooing of Etain in its depiction of the queen's abduction and subsequent rescue even though Ulrich's version of the abduction story is much longer than the Irish tale. In both of these accounts the basic plot is identical; a king, who apparently has a prior claim to the wife of a second king, comes to the court to demand her of her husband. He asks a boon of the husband and proposes a contest in which he is at first bested. He departs only to return unlooked for later, snatch the queen away from her escort, and carry her off to his home, a mountain stronghold. When the king and his armies find that they are incapable of rescuing the queen by themselves they resort to supernatural aid in the guise of a druid or magician and with this help are able to succor the queen and raze the abductor's fortress.

Discrepancies between the two accounts are thus but slight and are mainly due to rationalisation and adaptation of the mythological or strictly Celtic features of the original tale to conform to the tastes of a pre-courtly French audience. For example, the fairy creatures become ordinary mortals in the Lanzelet, the queen's previous marriage is rationalised into an alleged betrothal,[68] the druid is transformed into a magician, and the fairy mound evolves into a mountain fortress protected

by an enchanted forest. Interestingly, additional features in the Lanzelet, such as the serpents guarding the fortress and the maidens surrounding the abducted queen are present in other old Irish abduction tales[69] and may therefore have been interpolated in this abduction story at an early stage in its development. In any case, revision of the basic abduction story as related in the Wooing of Etain seems to be minor in the Lanzelet.

By contrast, the abduction tale as it appears in the Vita Gildae, although it retains some archaic elements which are lacking in the Lanzelet, was completely rewritten by Caradoc, presumably in order to further the financial interests and protect the political privileges of Glastonbury Abbey.[70] Thus, in accordance with the tale's new function the setting was changed, the violent denouement was replaced with a peaceful ending,[71] and the magical or mythological elements were eliminated or rationalised (e.g. the Irish druid in the story was supplanted by a Welsh saint, while the preamble to the tale, with its frequent allusions to mythological characters and heathen customs, was simply elided).

Nevertheless, numerous features of the original legend are still visible in Caradoc's account. The queen is still carried off by a royal abductor to a mountain fortress (for the island of Glastonbury is dominated by a hill, Glastonbury Tor)[72] which her husband locates only after a year of searching. Moreover, in both accounts the king can regain his captive queen only with the help of a religious leader. Thus the basic plot of the episode in the Vita Gildae conforms fairly closely to that of its Irish model,[73] and wherever it does diverge from this model, the deviations can be easily accounted for by consideration of Caradoc's non-literary motive for including the abduction tale in the Vita Gildae.

Surprisingly, most critics have missed the important fact that the episode in the Vita Gildae parallels not only the Wooing of Etain but also the abduction story related in the Lanzelet. Indeed, in one respect Caradoc's version of the tale corresponds more closely to Ulrich's account of the abduction than it does to the Irish tale; in contrast to the Wooing of Etain both Ulrich and Caradoc allude to the ravished queen and her husband as Guinevere and Arthur. Furthermore, the impassable swamps surrounding the abductor's stronghold in the Vita Gildae bear some resemblance to the misty, serpent-infested thickets which protect Valerin's fortress from attack in the Lanzelet.[74]

On the other hand, the Lanzelet retains certain features of the Irish original such as the preamble and the violent denouement which are lacking in the Vita Gildae just as the latter perpetuates certain motifs in the Wooing of Etain such as the year long search for the queen which have been omitted in the Lanzelet. Since Caradoc could never have effectively utilised the abduction story like a second "Donation of Constantine" to confirm Glastonbury Abbey in its ancient rights and privileges if the tale had not previously already been associated with the exploits of some prestigious British monarch such as King Arthur in the mind of the public, it therefore follows that the abduction episodes in Caradoc's work and in the Urlanzelet were both derived from a common source which was not the Wooing of Etain itself, but a revision of the latter in which the characters were merely rechristened and transplanted into a British, rather than an Irish, setting. The evolution of the abduction tale up to the point of its incorporation into the Urlanzelet is thus quite straightforward and any revisions of the original legend are easily accounted for.

Unfortunately, this is not the case where the parallel account in the CdlC is concerned, for the exact nature of the relationship of Chrétien's epic to these earlier versions of the abduction tale has never been satisfactorily established. Obviously, because the CdlC deviates farthest from the original legend as recounted in the Wooing of Etain, Chrétien must have either completely rewritten his source or based his epic on a lost version of the tale that had itself been extensively revised, or both. In any case, the complexity of the plot in the CdlC as well as the length of the latter indicate that Chrétien's variant of the abduction tale was far removed from the simplicity of the original anecdote and must be considered a late adaptation of this popular story.

Nonetheless, some critics have attempted to derive the CdlC from the abduction episode in the Vita Gildae. For example, it has been tentatively suggested that the rushing torrent which restricts access to Meleagant's fortress in the CdlC comprises an analogue to the swamps surrounding Glastonbury alluded to in the Vita Gildae.[75] Likewise "Meleagant," the designation of the abductor in Chrétien's epic, is allegedly a gallicized version of the Celtic name, "Melwas," borne by the ravisher in Caradoc's account.[76] Furthermore, Baudemagus' role as mediator and peacemaker in the CdlC is to some extent reminiscent of the conciliatory roles played by Gildas and the abbot in Caradoc's work. Consequently it seems that Chrétien's Lancelot epic could have been based, at least in part, on Caradoc's version of the abduction tale.

However, the evidence just adduced to prove the derivation of certain motifs in the CdlC from the Vita Gildae is in several respects defective and unconvincing. Firstly, it must be noted that the etymology of the name "Meleagant" is still uncertain, for attempts to connect the name of

Chrétien's villain with that of his Celtic counterpart in Caradoc's work fail to take into account the fact that the rules of Welsh pronunciation seem to preclude a French transcription of the Celtic appellation as "Meleagant".[77] Instead a Welsh "Maelwas" would be transcribed as "Maheloas" in French as it is in Chretién's Erec:

> Avuec ceus que m'oez nomer
> Vint Maheloas, uns hauz ber,
> Li sire de l'Isle de Voirre. (v. 1945 ff.)[78]
>
> Along with those whom I have just mentioned came Maheloas, a great baron, lord of the Isle of Voirre.

Here the author refers to Maheloas as the lord of the Isle of Glass, an island which Caradoc through a false etymology identifies with Glastonbury.[79] Thus the main argument for a relationship between the CdlC and Vita Gildae is rendered suspect. Secondly, the parallel between the conciliatory roles played by Gildas and the abbot in Caradoc's account and by Baudemagus in Chrétien's version is imperfect since in Caradoc's work the abbot and Gildas act as disinterested third parties to bring about a peaceful reconciliation of the warring factions and the restoration of the queen to her rightful husband, whereas in Chrétien's epic Baudemagus, who is actually related to the abductor, is largely ineffective in his efforts to prevent a conflict and reconcile the combatants. Finally, it should be obvious that the river protecting Meleagant's castle in the CdlC bears very little actual resemblance to the swamps of the Vita Gildae but is instead somewhat reminiscent of the river crossed by the bridge "ze dem Stiebenden stege" (Lanz. v. 7140-7146) in the Lanzelet. Thus there really appears to be little evidence for the claim that Chrétien based the CdlC principally on Caradoc's version of the abduction tale.

On the other hand, another possible source for many of the motifs found in the CdlC lies close at hand in the form of the Urlanzelet as it

is reflected in its German translation, the Lanzelet,[80] for, although many researchers have discounted the possibility that Chrétien could have derived the material for the CdlC from an older Lancelot epic, only this hypothesis satisfactorily explains the parallels between the two works and simultaneously accounts for Chrétien's divergence from the original abduction tale. As a matter of fact, where Chrétien departs most markedly from the plot of the Wooing of Etain he is frequently following in the footsteps of the author of the Urlanzelet, who was forced to modify and expand on the original abduction legend in order to transform what was originally an independent anecdote into a series of episodes within the framework of his Lancelot epic. Chrétien merely adopts the innovative themes and motifs introduced into the abduction story by the author of the Urlanzelet and then develops them further and elaborates on them while simultaneously deleting some of the original features of the tale which appeared in the Wooing of Etain or the Vita Gildae. For example, in the latter two works the warriors of the king pursuing the abductor are never singled out for a particular role in the quest nor are they ever identifed by name but remain a faceless host, whereas in the Lanzelet, although the vengeful sovereign is still accompanied by a large army in his quest for the queen, several members of this army, including Lancelot and Gawain, are identified by name and are assigned prominent roles in the action. Chrétien carries this modification of the original legend one step further in the CdlC by having only the two heroes, Lancelot and Gawain, attempt the rescue of Guinevere after King Arthur and his remaining knights have broken off their pursuit of her abductor, and by having Lancelot usurp the king's role, not only as the rescuer, but also as the lover of the queen.[81] Moreover, where Ulrich deviates from the original abduction tale

by depicting a single combat between the queen's champion, Lancelot, and the abductor, in which the latter is ignominiously defeated, Chrétien further embellishes the tale by portraying Lancelot as the queen's victorious champion in not just one, but three successive duels with the abductor. Additionally, in both the Lanzelet and the CdlC the rash boon motif is modified so that the granting of a boon results in another knight usurping Gawain's traditional role as the queen's champion.

Likewise the two perilous bridges which guard the approaches to the abductor's castle in the CdlC are nowhere mentioned in the Wooing of Etain or the Vita Gildae but have recognizable analogues in the Lanzelet. For example, as Webster has noted, Chrétien's water bridge closely resembles the invisible causeway in Ulrich's epic that links Malduc's island fortress to the mainland,[82] while the sword bridge in the CdlC is related to Ulrich's "Stiebender stec" since the latter must also be a dangerously narrow bridge or the horses' eyes would not need to be bound before they could be persuaded to cross it. It could therefore be argued that in creating his sword bridge, Chrétien has simply exaggerated to an extreme the most prominent feature of the corresponding bridge in the Urlanzelet. Thus those motifs which were originally foreign to the abduction tale but were introduced into it by the author of the Urlanzelet are frequently included in revised form in the CdlC as well. The conclusion must be that Chrétien appropriates material from the Urlanzelet for his CdlC, refines it, and imaginatively molds it to finally produce a totally different version of the Lancelot legend.

In fact, Chrétien exhibits this tendency to adopt and adapt material from the Urlanzelet not only with regard to the abduction tale proper, but throughout the CdlC, as is evidenced by the large number of parallels between the two epics. As Alois Wolfe points out, for example, Chrétien

adopts the motif of the hero's anonymity from the Urlanzelet but completely changes its thrust by concealing Lancelot's identity solely from the audience and from some of the other characters portrayed in the CdlC instead of depicting his hero as ignorant of his own name.[83] Likewise, in the case of the Galagandreiz episode, Chrétien refines the story by modifying or deleting the uncourtly elements of the adventure, thereby completely altering the tone and intention of the passage as it stood in his source. First of all, because a knife-throwing duel is uncourtly and because the hero prevails over his opponent in this duel in an unchivalrous manner, Chrétien casually deletes the human opponents and the uncourtly weapons and replaces them with a flaming lance wielded by an unseen hand, whereby the adventure becomes more perilous and mysterious while the hero appears in a nobler light. Yet, as has been demonstrated, because Chrétien retains numerous features of the original story, such as the motif of the hero being wounded by a hurled weapon and the three beds motif, it is soon apparent that this episode of the CdlC, too, is based on a corresponding segment of the Urlanzelet.

In a second departure from his source Chrétien deals even more freely with his material, taking the scene in the Galagandreiz episode where the hero proves his mettle by daring to bed Galagandreiz' daughter, divorcing it from its original context, and utilising it to create an independent episode in the CdlC in which Lancelot proves his worth, not by bedding the seductress, but by remaining chaste and resisting the charms of the temptress who insists on sharing his bed. Thus Chrétien consistently borrows raw material for the CdlC from the Urlanzelet but then deletes, adds or re-arranges motifs and otherwise modifies his source in order to create an Anti-Urlanzelet illustrating the theme of courtly love, a theme

which Chrétien himself introduced into the epic and which comprises the "san" of the epic alluded to by Chrétien in the prologue to the CdlC (v. 26)[84] just as the Urlanzelet probably comprised his "matière."

E. The Relative Chronology of the Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Epics

The CdlC must therefore be contemplated as an adaptation of the Urlanzelet rather than vice versa for, as Webster notes,

> "... a close comparison of the two pieces will show that a surprising number of subsidiary motifs in the Charrette have an older, more elaborate and more satisfactory form in the Lanzelet."[85]

Moreover, as has already been demonstrated, there is no reason whatsoever to believe that the author of Ulrich's source borrowed motifs from any of Chrétien's epics other than perhaps Erec, particularly since the Lanzelet lacks all references to such Arthurian heroes as Cligès and Perceval, references which generally betray the work of an epigon. Indeed, considering the fact that the pertinent episodes in Cligès and Ivain are less archaic than their analogues in the Lanzelet it would be logical to assume that they had been borrowed from the Urlanzelet. The viability of such an assumption is further confirmed by the observation that Chrétien treats his source material rather freely, interpolating, deleting or revising episodes and motifs wherever he sees fit. For example, the bloody bed[86] and adultery motifs in the CdlC and the illicit love theme and associated motifs in Cligès[87] did not originate with those works but were derived by Chrétien from the Tristan legend, while the falling portcullis and magical ring motifs in the CdlC are duplicated in Ivain. The conclusion that the Urlanzelet antedated Chrétien's Ivain and Cligès and probably furnished him with material for them is thus both natural and logical, for Förster's argument that the Urlanzelet, because the Lanzelet

makes fleeting reference to the courtly institution of the "Minnehof", must also have contained an allusion to a court of love and consequently must have been composed late in the twelfth century after Chrétien's works had already been penned,[88] totally lacks credibility; firstly because usages associated with the cult of "hohe Minne" such as the convocation of a court of love generally originated as literary fantasies long before they were actually put into practice, and secondly, because even some of the earliest French courtly epics such as Tristan and Chrétien's Cligès already express many of the basic concepts of the philosophy of courtly love in its various manifestations,[89] concepts which are only later elucidated and elaborated on by Andreas Capellanus. Thus the evidence clearly indicates that not only was the author of the Urlanzelet no epigon, but that he was one of the very first French authors to compose an Arthurian epic.

In fact there are some signs that the Urlanzelet may have antedated Chrétien's Erec and, since the latter work and the Lanzelet parallel each other closely in their description of the heroine's horse and in their account of the hunting of the white stag, may even have contributed material to it. First of all, it is noteworthy that the name "Arthur" generally retains its final "r" when declined in the Lanzelet whereas this occurs only once in Chrétien's epics, namely in Erec. Since the retention of the final "r" of "Arthur" in declined forms of the name was already an archaic feature in the French of Chrétien's time and since the frequent presence of the final "r" in the monarch's name in the MHG Lanzelet presumably signals its retention in Ulrich's French source it would seem that the Urlanzelet was composed prior to or contemporary with Chrétien's first Arthurian epic.[90]

This deduction is supported by the fact that Chrétien already alludes to Lancelot du Lac as one of the foremost knights of Arthur's court in Erec (v. 1694) and Cligès[91] (v. 4765 ff.) and in the former work even goes so far as to mention a King Ban of Gomeret or Ganieret (Erec. v. 1975) whom critics have identified with King Ban of Benoic in the French Prose Lancelot and King Pant of Genewis in the Lanzelet,[92] both of whom play the role of Lancelot's father in the respective works in which they appear, for Chrétien's casual use of the hero's epithet "du Lac"[93] and his reference to the hero's royal father imply that he was already well acquainted with the Lancelot legend before he wrote his Erec and suggest that his public was equally familiar with the character of Lancelot.

In addition, the speculation of Weston[94] and Singer[95] that the name of "Mauduiz li sages," who is included by Chrétien in a catalogue of Arthurian knights in Erec (v. 1699), can be identified with the name of one of the principal characters in the Lanzelet, "der wise Malduc," and that Chrétien must have borrowed this name from the Urlanzelet has some merit, because the use of the sobriquet "the wise" is warranted by the role played by the evil magician, Malduc, in the Lanzelet but is not accounted for in Erec where "Mauduiz" is merely a name in a list. Moreover, the appearance of a villain called Mauduyt in the French Prose Lancelot in a role which in some respects parallels that of the nefarious sorceror, Malduc, in Ulrich's work[96] seems to confirm that Chrétien's Mauduiz is somehow linked to Ulrich's Malduc.

However, the problem of determining the relationship between Chrétien's Mauduiz and the Malduc of the Lanzelet is greatly complicated by Zwierzina's disclosure that Chrétien's character, Mauduiz, more closely resembles yet another figure in the Lanzelet, namely that of "der wise

Maldûz," (Lanz. v. 6052)[97] who like Chrétien's Mauduiz is portrayed as an ordinary Arthurian knight, a parallel which could best be explained by assuming either that Ulrich or the author of the Urlanzelet borrowed the name "Maldûz" from Chrétien's Erec or that Chrétien derived the name "Mauduiz" from the "Maldûz" of the Urlanzelet.

Meanwhile, since the Malduz of the Lanzelet has a close analogue in Maduc, the villain of the Old French Livre d' Artus,[98] and has also been identified with the Mardoc of the sculpture on the archivolt of the cathedral at Modena,[99] and since both a Malduit (v. 642) and, in one manuscript, a Malduz (v. 1551) are mentioned in the Chanson de Rolant[100] it may well be that either Chrétien or the author of the Urlanzelet borrowed one of the latter names from the former work and that the "Malduc" of the Lanzelet therefore originally was not the source of either Ulrich's "Maldûz" or Chrétien's "Mauduiz," but fortuitously came to resemble the latter names and became confused with them, possibly when it was transcribed into MHG. Consequently, although the appearance of the parallel names "Maldûz" and "Mauduiz" in the Lanzelet and Chrétien's Erec respectively does furnish one more indication that the latter and the Urlanzelet were in some way related, the similarity of these names to each other and to "Malduc" cannot be exploited in order to determine the relative dates of composition of the Urlanzelet and Chrétien's Erec.

Nevertheless it is noteworthy that the epithets associated with Arthurian names which are recorded in both Chrétien's Erec and the Lanzelet are generally more functional and are elucidated more satisfactorily in Ulrich's work. In the latter the appellation of Dodines as "der wilde"[101] or of Lancelot as "du Lac" merely reflects the role played by these characters within the plot and is therefore appropriate

and readily comprehensible, whereas in Erec no grounds are given for the use of such sobriquets. Hence the Urlanzelet rather than Chrétien's Erec must be regarded as the ultimate source of these epithets, for Hofer's contention that the author of the Urlanzelet borrowed names from Chrétien and then invented stories to account for the attached epithets (if any)[102] is untenable because some of the names in the Lanzelet such as "Dodines," (v. 7098) "Roidurant," (v.7844) and "Lôût" (v. 6891), which reappear in Chrétien's Erec (v. 1700; 2182; 1732), there lack the respective epithets, "mit den breiten handen", "der snelle", and "der milte", which are associated with them in Ulrich's work.

Moreover, Warnatsch has ascertained that the appellation "d'Estrangot" in Chrétien's Erec (v. 1710), which describes a knight whose name in the various manuscript readings (Garravains, Gorsoein, Gasauens, Gasoras) resembles the name of one of Guinevere's abductors, Gasoein or Gasozein de Dragôz, in Heinrich von dem Türlin's Diu Crône (v. 4775) is merely a corrupt form of the epithet "d'estraint gaut" which is accurately translated by Ulrich in the Lanzelet as "von dem Verworrenen tan," (v. 4981),[103] all of which implies that this epithet first appeared in its proper form in the Urlanzelet and was only later borrowed by Chrétien and Heinrich von dem Türlin after it had been distorted and miscopied by a careless scribe. The available evidence therefore seems to imply that the Urlanzelet antedated Chrétien's Erec.

If Chrétien did indeed borrow material for his Erec from the Urlanzelet, then it is remarkable that in the latter he chooses not to allude to any of Lancelot's numerous adventures, omits all reference to prominent characters in the Urlanzelet such as Iblis, Iweret, Linier, and Valerin, and categorizes Galegantins, whose namesake Galagandreiz is

designated as a villain in the Lanzelet, as a respectable Arthurian knight. Then, too, the fact that Erec plays a leading role in the Lanzelet could be an indication that he was already a dominant figure in Arthurian legend when the Urlanzelet was being composed, while the fact that Ulrich in his description of the stag hunt in the Lanzelet neglects to explain why this custom should engender strife at the court suggests that both the author of the Urlanzelet and his public were already aware of the cause of the anticipated strife due to their prior familiarity with the tale of the stag hunt as it appeared in the Erec legend.[104] Consequently, if it were granted that the references in Chrétien's Erec to characters portrayed in the Lanzelet could have been based, not on the Urlanzelet, but on an even earlier Lancelot epic or lay now lost or on oral tradition, one might be tempted to ascribe parallels between Chrétien's Erec and the Lanzelet to imitation of the former by the author of the Urlanzelet.

Yet by the same reasoning, because Lancelot is accorded a high ranking within the hierarchy of Arthurian knights in Chrétien's Erec and because Ulrich von Zatzikhoven fails to allude to any of Erec's adventures as they are recorded in Chrétien's epic[105] and omits any mention of several of the most prominent characters in Erec such as Ither, Mabonagrain, and Enid (although an epigon presumably would have delighted in doing so) one could justifiably postulate that the allusions to Erec and to the stag hunt in the Lanzelet were ultimately derived, not from Chrétien's work, but from oral tradition or from some other lost Erec epic or lay. Thus the parallels between the Lanzelet and Chrétien's Erec could be attributable to borrowing by Chrétien from the Urlanzelet.

Interestingly, Chrétien himself in the prologue to his Erec confirms this latter possibility by referring to the existence of versions of the Erec legend differing from and antedating his own work, whereas the existence of a Lancelot epic antedating the Urlanzelet, although postulated by several critics, has never been verified. As a result, the evidence, although scanty, seems to favor the conclusion that the Urlanzelet was composed before Chrétien's surviving epics and thereby appears to corroborate Weston's theory about the nature of the Urlanzelet, namely that the latter was molded together from a concatenation of originally independent lays - such as the fabliau Le Mantel Mautaillé which furnished the ultimate source of the Mantelprobe episode in the Lanzelet - which became mere episodes in their new context.[106] Thus unless new evidence to the contrary is brought to light the Urlanzelet may be considered one of the pioneering works in the development of the French Arthurian epic.

F. The Relationship between the Lanzelet and Urlanzelet

Unfortunately, because Ulrich's source has failed to survive the ravages of time, the exact nature of the relationship between the Lanzelet and Urlanzelet remains open to question. Did Ulrich merely translate his source word for word as much as poetic considerations of rhyme and meter permitted, or did he treat his source more freely, revising and modifying it and interpolating personal comments or allusions to other works in his adaptation? On the one hand, Ulrich's own statements as well as the proliferation of parallels between the Lanzelet, the CdlC, and the French Prose Lancelot would seem to indicate that Ulrich faithfully reproduced the story related in his source,[107] a conclusion which is supported by the

fact that most early MHG epicists essentially did little more than translate their French sources.[108] Yet on the other hand, the presence in the Lanzelet of passages which were obviously borrowed from earlier MHG epics such as Veldeke's Eneide and Eilhart's Tristrant reveals that Ulrich was not averse to adding to or modifying his source and this impression is reinforced by the presence in the epilogue to the Lanzelet of Ulrich's own references to the circumstances leading to his acquisition and translation of Hugh de Morville's "welschez buoch," references which obviously constitute an interpolation.

Consequently, although the majority of critics incline to the opinion that the Lanzelet does essentially reproduce its French original, the question of the precise degree of Ulrich's dependence on his French source will never be conclusively resolved unless the lost Urlanzelet is at some future date rediscovered.

Notes

[1] Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, Lanzelet, ed. K.A. Hahn (Frankfurt a.M., 1945; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965). All subsequent quotations of the Lanzelet are derived from this edition.

[2] Jakob Bächtold, Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, Diss. Frauenfeld 1870 (Frauenfeld: J. Huber, 1870), pp. 34, 35.

[3] Roger Sherman Loomis, "The Fier Baiser in Mandeville's Travels, Arthurian romance and Irish saga," Studi Medievali, NS 17 (1951), 106.

[4] Paul Märtens, "Zur Lanzelotsage. Eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung," Romanische Studien, 5 (1880), 690-700.

[5] Dagmar Ó Riain-Raedel, Untersuchungen zur mythischen Struktur der mittelhochdeutschen Artusepen: Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, "Lanzelet" - Hartmann von Aue, "Erec" und "Iwein", Philologische Studien und Quellen, 91 (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1978), p. 93.

[6] Märtens, pp. 690-700.

[7] Kenneth G.T. Webster, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Welschez Buoch,'" Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, 16 (1934), 203-228.

[8] James Douglas Bruce, The Evolution of the Arthurian Romance From the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300, 2nd ed. (1928; rpt. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958), I, 210.

[9] Stefan Hofer, Chrétien de Troyes; Leben und Werke des altfranzösischen Epikers (Graz: Böhlau, 1954), pp. 147, 148.

[10] Kurt Ruh, 'Reinhart Fuchs', 'Lanzelet', Wolfram von Eschenbach, Gottfried von Strassburg, Vol. II of Höfische Epik des deutschen Mittelalters, Grundlagen der Germanistik, 25 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1980), pp. 35, 36.

[11] Wolfgang Golther, rev. of Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre), ed. by Wendelin Förster, Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 22 (1900), Part II, 3.

[12] Jessie L. Weston, The Legend of Sir Lancelot du Lac: Studies upon its Origin, Development, and Position in the Arthurian Romantic Cycle (London: David Nutt, 1901), pp. 18-20.

[13] Samuel Singer, rev. of The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the Year 1300, by James Douglas Bruce, Litteris, 3, No. 2 (Sept. 1926), 126, 127.

[14] Stefan Hofer, "Der 'Lanzelet' des Ulrich von Zazikhoven und seine französische Quelle," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 75 (1959), 35.

[15] Ruh, pp. 35, 36.

[16] Bruce, pp. 210-215.

[17] Ibid., p. 211.

[18] Ernst Soudek, "Suspense in the Early Arthurian Epic: An Introduction to Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Lancelet,'" in Studies in the Lancelot Legend, Rice University Studies, 58, No. 1 (Houston: William Marsh Rice University, 1972), pp. 4-9, 18.

[19] Emmanuel Philipot, "Un épisode d'Érec et Énide: la 'Joie de la Cour.'-Mabon l'enchanteur," Romania, 25 (1896), 276.

[20] Hofer, "Der'Lanzelet,'" p. 6.

[21] Bruce, p. 211.

[22] E. Brugger, "'Der Schöne Feigling' in der arthurischen Literatur," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 63 (1943), 125.

[23] Emmanuel Philipot, rev. of Studies on the Libeaus Desconus, by William Henry Schofield, Romania, 26 (1897), 297-300.

[24] Rudolf Zenker, "Weiteres zur Mabinogionfrage," Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 48 (1926), 95, 96.

[25] Madeleine Pelner Cosman, The Education of the Hero in Arthurian Romance (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), pp. 104-109.

[26] Roger Sherman Loomis, "Morgain la Fée and the Celtic Goddesses," Speculum, 20 (1945), 183-203; rpt. in his Wales and the Arthurian Legend (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1956), p. 111.

[27] Roger Sherman Loomis, "Objections to the Celtic Origin of the 'Matière de Bretagne,'" Romania, 79 (1958), 47-77; rpt. in his Studies in Medieval Literature: A Memorial Collection of Essays (New York: B. Franklin, 1970), p. 127.

[28] Jessie L. Weston, The Three Days' Tournament: A Study in Romance and Folk-Lore (London, 1902; [rpt.] New York: Haskell House, 1965), pp. 41, 42.

[29] Roger Sherman Loomis, The Development of Arthurian Romance (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1963), p. 30.

[30] Helga Schüppert, "Minneszenen und Struktur im 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven," Würzburger Prosastudien, 2 (1975), 127n.

[31] Jean Frappier, "The Vulgate Cycle," in Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages; A Collaborative History, ed. R.S. Loomis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), p. 300.

[32] Wendelin Förster, Kristian von Troyes; Wörterbuch zu seinen sämtlichen Werken (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1914), pp. 109-113.

[33] Bruce, p. 212.

[34] Wendelin Förster, ed., Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre), by Chrétien de Troyes, Vol. IV of Christian von Troyes sämtliche erhaltene Werke (Halle, 1899; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965), p. xliii.

[35] Förster, Wörterbuch, pp. 111-113.

[36] Ó'Riain-Raedel, p. 152.

[37] Förster, Wörterbuch, pp. 99-106, 119.

[38] Roger Sherman Loomis, Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911), pp. 264, 265.

[39] Chrétien de Troyes, Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre), Vol. IV of Christian von Troyes sämtliche erhaltene Werke, ed. Wendelin Förster (Halle, 1899; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965) - All subsequent quotations of the CdlC are derived from this edition.

[40] W.W. Comfort, trans., Arthurian Romances, by Chrétien de Troyes (1914; rpt. London: J.M. Dent, 1975) - All subsequent quotations from translations of Chrétien's works are derived from this anthology.

[41] Förster, ed., Der Karrenritter, p. xliii.

[42] Hofer, "Der 'Lanzelet,'" p. 10.

[43] Weston, Tournament, pp. 16-20, 37-43.

[44] Charles Henry Carter, "Ipomedon, an Illustration of Romance Origin," in Haverford Essays: Studies in Modern Literature Prepared by Some Former Pupils of Professor Francis B. Gummere... (1909; rpt. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1967), pp. 248-251.

[45] Bruce, pp. 211, 212.

[46] Carter, pp. 249, 250.

[47] Ibid., p. 250.

[48] Werner Richter, Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, Deutsche Forschungen, 27 (Frankfurt a.M.: Diesterweg, 1934), pp. 52-55.

[49] Hofer, "Der 'Lanzelet,'" p. 6.

[50] Loomis, Arthurian Tradition, pp. 80, 81.

[51] Hofer, "Der 'Lanzelet,'" p. 29.

[52] Loomis, Arthurian Tradition, pp. 77-81.

[53] Urban Tigner Holmes, Jr., A History of Old French Literature from the Origins to 1300, revised ed. (New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), p. 175.

[54] Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang. 1170-1250, Vol. II of Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, ed. Helmut de Boor and Richard Newald, 10th ed. (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1979), p. 81.

[55] Golther, pp. 3, 4.

[56] Webster, pp. 209, 210.

[57] Ibid., pp. 204, 205.

[58] Ibid., pp. 204, 205, 210.

[59] Kenneth G.T. Webster, rev. of Lancelot and Guinevere, by Tom Peete Cross and William A. Nitze, Modern Language Notes, 46 (1931), 56.

[60] Webster, "Ulrich," pp. 204-206.

[61] Golther, pp. 3, 4.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Hofer, Chrétien, p. 148.

[64] Gaston Paris, rev. of Von den ersten Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, Vol. I of Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur, by Wolfgang Golther, Romania, 22 (1893), 167.

[65] Roger Sherman Loomis, Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance (1927; rpt. New York: Haskell House, 1967), pp. 6-11.

[66] Kenneth G.T. Webster, "Arthur and Charlemagne," Englische Studien, 36 (1906), 349, 350.

[67] Ibid., pp. 348, 349.

[68] Ibid., p. 350.

[69] Tom Peete Cross and William Albert Nitze, Lancelot and Guinevere: A Study on the Origins of Courtly Love (Chicago, 1930; rpt. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1964), pp. 37, 38. nn.

[70] Ferdinand Lot, "Nouvelles études sur la provenance du cycle arthurien: Glastonbury et Avalon," Romania, 27 (1898), 564-567.

[71] Gaston Paris, "Études sur les romans de la Table Ronde. Lancelot du Lac. II. Le Conte de la Charrette," Romania, 12 (1883), 511, 512.

[72] Webster, "Arthur," pp. 348, 349.

[73] Cross and Nitze, pp. 52-55.

[74] Kenneth G.T. Webster, Guinevere; A Study of her Abductions (Milton, Mass.: Turtle Press, 1951), p. 20.

[75] Howard Rollin Patch, The Other World according to Descriptions in Medieval Literature, Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, NS 1, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), pp. 304, 305.

[76] Ferdinand Lot, "Celtica," Romania, 24 (1895), 327, 328.

[77] Zimmer as quoted by Förster, ed., Der Karrenritter, p. xxxviii.

[78] Chrétien de Troyes, Erec und Enide, Vol. III of Christian von Troyes sämtliche Werke, ed. Wendelin Förster (Halle, 1890; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965)) - All subsequent quotations of Erec et Enide are derived from this edition.

[79] Gaston Paris, "Études sur les romans de la Table Ronde," Romania, 10 (1881), 490-492.

[80] Kenneth G.T. Webster, "The Water-Bridge in Chrétien's 'Charrette,'" Modern Language Review, 26 (1931), 70, 71.

[81] Gertrude (Schoepperle) Loomis, Tristan and Isolt; A Study of the Sources of the Romance, 2nd ed. (New York: B. Franklin, 1960), II, 538-540.

[82] Webster, "Water-Bridge," pp. 69-73.

[83] Alois Wolf, "'Ja por les Fers ne Remanra' (Chrétiens 'Karrenritter' V. 4600): Minnebann, ritterliches Selbstbewusstsein und concordia voluntatum," Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch im Auftrage der Görres-Gesellschaft, NS 20 (1979), 32-35, 44, 48.

[84] Jean Marx, Nouvelles recherches sur la littérature arthurienne, Bibliothèque francaise et romane, Série C: Études littéraires, 9 (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1965), pp. 244, 266, 268.

[85] Webster, "Water-Bridge," p. 71.

[86] Jean Frappier, "Chrétien de Troyes," in Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages, p. 178.

[87] Hendricus Sparnaay, Verschmelzung legendarischer und weltlicher Motive in der Poesie des Mittelalters (Groningen: Noordhoff, 1922), pp. 145, 146.

[88] Förster, Wörterbuch, p. 113n.

[89] Arthur C.L. Brown, "The Grail and the English 'Sir Perceval,'" Modern Philology, 17 (1919), 363.

[90] Samuel Singer, "Lanzelet," in Aufsätze und Vorträge (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912), pp. 148, 149.

[91] Weston, Tournament, pp. 18-20.

[92] Henri de Briel and Manuel Herrmann, King Arthur's Knights and the Myths of the Round Table; A new Approach to the French Lancelot in Prose (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1972), pp. 147-149.

[93] Lewis Thorpe, The Lancelot in the Arthurian Prose Vulgate, Wheaton College Monograph Series, 1 (Wheaton College, Ill.: Department of English: Wheaton College, 1980), pp. 8-11.

[94] Weston, The Legend of Sir Lancelot, p. 80.

[95] Singer, "Lanzelet," pp. 155, 156.

[96] Richter, p. 74.

[97] Konrad Zwierzina, "Mittelhochdeutsche Studien," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum and deutsche Literatur, 45 (1901), 368.

[98] Singer, "Lanzelet," p. 160.

[99] Cross and Nitze, p. 23.

[100] Teresa Mary de Glinka-Janczewski, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet: a critical study," M.A. Diss. University of London 1963, pp. 205, 206.

[101] G. Huet, "Deux personnages arturiens," Romania, 43 (1914), 97-100.

[102] Hofer, Chrétien, p. 148.

[103] Otto Warnatsch, Der Mantel. Bruchstück eines Lanzeletromans des Heinrich von dem Türlin, Germanistische Abhandlungen, 2 (Breslau, 1883; rpt. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1977), p. 126, nn.

[104] René Pérennec, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Lanzelet. Traduction en francais moderne. Accompagnée d'une introduction et de notes," Diss. Université de Paris 1970, II, 36, n.3.

[105] Richter, pp. 88, 89.

[106] Weston, The Legend of Sir Lancelot, pp. 18-20.

[107] Webster, "Ulrich," pp. 203, 228.

[108] Märtens, p. 689.

III. The Date of Composition of the Lanzelet and its Relationship to Comtemporary MHG Epics

A. The Problem

Until only a few decades ago one of the most controversial topics in the area of Lanzelet-research was the debate about the date of composition of Ulrich's epic, for like most MHG epics, the Lanzelet itself never directly specifies its exact date of origin nor do the external sources which allude to it. As a result, various techniques have been developed in an effort to establish the Lanzelet's position within the framework of medieval literary chronology and numerous articles have been written to prove that Ulrich's work was penned either before or after Hartmann's Erec, Wolfram's Parzival or some other medieval German epic. Yet, as Pérennec notes, in spite of all the research and discussion on this topic, the problem of determining when relative to other MHG epics the Lanzelet was composed has never been satisfactorily resolved.[1]

It therefore comes as something of a surprise that the majority of critics now believe that Hartmann had completed at least his Erec, if not all of his epics, before Ulrich wrote his Lanzelet, particularly since these scholars fail to adduce much new evidence in support of their views and instead merely content themselves with reiterating the often speculative arguments for the priority of Hartmann's Erec and/or Wolfram's Parzival advanced by their predecessors. Since the latter, because of the paucity of concrete evidence relating to the chronology of MHG epics, generally take a subjective approach to the problem and base their arguments on conjecture and hypothesis rather than on facts, a procedure which is prone to error and abuse, the validity of their conclusions is open to question and it is therefore necessary, first to carefully re-examine the methods employed and re-evaluate the arguments put forward

to determine the relative dates of composition of the epics concerned, and then to weigh the evidence, consider the alternatives, and thereby completely review the problem of ascertaining Ulrich's place in the pageant of MHG epicists.

B. Dating the Lanzelet through References to it in Other MHG Epics

As previously noted, a number of different methods have been developed by scholars in an attempt to calculate the relative dates of origin of the Lanzelet and the other MHG epics roughly contemporary with it, yet of these methods most are unviable or have not been applied objectively and scientifically. One of the first methods used for this purpose and the only one to rely exclusively on external literary sources for clues to the Lanzelet's date of composition draws on allusions to earlier epics in the works of mid- or late thirteenth century German authors for evidence. One such mid-thirteenth century author whose words are employed for this purpose by critics is Rudolf von Ems, who refers to Ulrich von Zatzikhoven in his Alexander (v. 3199 ff.)[2] and Willehalm von Orlens (v. 2198 ff.).[3] Rudolf alludes to Ulrich in two catalogues of MHG authors here briefly outlined:

	Alexander	Willehalm von Orlens
1.	Heinrich von Veldeke	Heinrich von Veldeke
2.	Hartmann von Aue	Hartmann von Aue
3.	Wolfram von Eschenbach	Wolfram von Eschenbach
4.	Gottfried von Strassburg	Gottfried von Strassburg
5.	Konrad von Heimesfurt	Bligger von Steinach
6.	Wirnt von Gravenberg	Ulrich von Zatzikhoven
7.	Ulrich von Zatzikhoven	Wirnt von Gravenberg
8.	Bligger von Steinach	Freidank[4]

Critics simply assume that these names are arranged in chronological order,[5] presumably according to the respective dates of composition of the first major works produced by each author, since the dates of birth and death of these poets would have been unknown to Rudolf.

Gruhn, however, objects that Rudolf would have been unlikely to know precisely when the works of individual authors were composed since they were never published as books are today.[6] Haupt suggests that Rudolf could have arranged his lists of authors chronologically according to the date when he and/or his fellow citizens first became acquainted with their individual works[7] (which tells us little about their actual date of composition), but Wackernagel points out that Rudolf could have arranged his lists of authors according to a different criterion altogether such as the degree of talent manifested or the popularity enjoyed by the individual poets.[8] Then again, considerations of rhyme and meter might have determined the position of each poet's name in Rudolf's catalogue or the names may have been listed randomly.

In any case it is certain that the names in these lists of MHG authors definitely do not follow any sort of reliable chronological order, for Gruhn has shown that, although Gottfried von Strassburg clearly identifies Bligger von Steinach as his predecessor by referring to him in Tristan (v. 4692 f.),[9] Rudolf von Ems not only inserts Bligger's name after that of Gottfried in one of his lists, but even relegates Bligger to the eighth position in the catalogue of authors in his other epic. In addition, Bligger alludes to Saladin, who died in 1193, in the present tense in one of his poems:

> diu mir ist alse Dômas Saladîne
> und lieber mohte sîn wol tûsent stunt. (MF 119, 11f.)

As Gruhn observes, this suggests that Saladin was still alive when these verses were written and indicates that Bligger himself must have begun his literary activity prior to 1193,[10] a fact which effectively eliminates Haupt's argument that Rudolf arranged his lists of authors in chronological order but indiscriminately grouped Bligger, Gottfried,

Ulrich, and Wirnt together as contemporaries.[11] Moreover, Ulrich von Zatzikhoven appears in one of Rudolf's lists as Bligger's predecessor, yet in the other as his successor. It is therefore obvious that Rudolf's catalogues of MHG poets are not arranged in any sort of chronological order and consequently can have no bearing whatsoever on the problem of establishing the relative dates of composition of late twelfth and early thirteenth century German epics.[12]

Similar flaws can be detected in Teresa de Glinka-Janczewski's argument that Heinrich von Freiberg's poetic enumeration of Arthurian heroes in his late thirteenth century work Die Ritterfahrt des Johann von Michelsberg can be employed to establish the relative chronology of turn of the century Arthurian romances:

> Die schrift der buoche uns tuot bekant
> waz Parzival, Iwein, Gâwân
> ritterschaft gepflogen hân,
> her Êrec unde Gamuret,
> Wîgalois und Lanzilet,
> margrâve Wilhelm und Titurel. (v. 16 ff.)[13]

Although Glinka-Janczewski makes the assumption that the Arthurian knights mentioned are ranked according to the dates of composition of the respective epics in which they play the role of principal character,[14] Heinrich himself never suggests such a possibility. Moreover, even a cursory examination of Heinrich's catalogue of heroes discloses that Erec is named only after Parzival and Iwein have already been referred to even though Zwierzina's analysis of rhyme patterns and stylistic tendencies in Hartmann's works clearly indicates that Erec was penned before Iwein,[15] while Wolfram's frequent allusions to Hartmann's Erec and Iwein in the Parzival prove that the former were written before the latter.[16] Thus Heinrich von Freiberg's enumeration of Arthurian heroes, like Rudolf's lists, offers no evidence about the date of origin of the epics in

question. Consequently, because it is based on the false premise that allusions to such epics in later works are arranged in such a way that they reflect the chronological order of composition of these epics, the method of dating MHG epics solely by utilising evidence garnered from external literary sources must be rejected.

C. Dating MHG Epics through Authors' Allusions to Historical Events

Since external sources by themselves shed no light on the problem of ascertaining when the Lanzelet originated, scholars have been forced to devise ways and means of dating MHG poems which rely on scrutiny of the texts themselves to furnish clues to the date of composition of individual epics. The least equivocal and frequently the most successful of such methods derives from the observation that medieval authors occasionally make references to current events in the course of writing their works, references that can be correlated with historical documents which record the dates when such events occurred in order to provide literary researchers with the terminus á quo for the pertinent epic, the date before which that work could not have been completed.

Especially forthcoming in this regard is Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, for his allusion in the epilogue of his work to King Richard the Lion-Hearted's imprisonment and subsequent release by Duke Leopold of Austria upon the latter's receipt of hostages guaranteeing payment of a large ransom offers a definite terminus a quo for the Lanzelet since Hugh de Morville, the owner of the book which Ulrich translated, and the other hostages exchanged for King Richard arrived in the Holy Roman Empire in February of 1194.[17] As a result, Ulrich could have commenced his work on the Lanzelet no earlier than the spring of that year.

Unfortunately, the terminus ad quem for Ulrich's work is much less easy to pinpoint, for Teresa de Glinka-Janczewski's claim that the depiction of Lancelot's childhood is based on that of the Hohenstaufen emperor Frederick II[18] cannot withstand even casual scrutiny. Comparison of Frederick's childhood experiences with those of his alleged literary counterpart, Lancelot, reveals few similarities. For example, Glinka-Janczewski to the contrary, the only truly unusual aspect of Frederick's infancy, the fact that he was a posthumous child,[19] finds no correspondence whatsoever in the Lanzelet where the hero is over a year old when orphaned. Moreover, comparison of Ulrich's epic with the French Prose Lancelot discloses that some of the tales recounted about Lancelot in the former work such as the account of Lancelot's upbringing at the hands of a foster mother, which Glinka-Janczewski concludes is nothing more than a reflection of events in Frederick's life,[20] have analogues in the French Prose Lancelot and therefore could not have been arbitrarily inserted into the Lancelot legend by Ulrich in order to honor the Hohenstaufens, but must instead already have been included in the text of the Urlanzelet. Likewise, Lancelot's multiple marriages, which Glinka-Janczewski maintains are reminiscences of Frederick's betrothal to one woman in 1202 and subsequent marriage to another in 1207,[21] have parallels in the CdlC, where Lancelot's amorous adventures are also recounted, and consequently must already have been portrayed in the Urlanzelet. Furthermore, Glinka-Janczewski's contention that the description in the Lanzelet of a golden sculpture of an eagle surmounting the tent pole of Lancelot's magic pavilion must comprise a gesture of homage to the Hohenstaufens on Ulrich's part because their heraldic emblem was an eagle[22] is discredited by the appearance of this motif in earlier

French and MHG versions of the Alexander legend in which it is a commonplace and from which Ulrich or the author of the Urlanzelet could have derived it.[23] Meanwhile the alleged parallel between Lancelot's double coronation and that of Frederick II[24] is spoiled by the fact that the latter was twice crowned Holy Roman Emperor, whereas Lancelot is crowned king of two separate realms. Thus there are absolutely no grounds for supposing that Ulrich modelled the life of Lancelot on that of the emperor Frederick II and consequently no justification exists for Glinka-Janczewski's assumption[25] that the Lanzelet was composed after Wolfram's Parzival and within the first two decades of the thirteenth century.

On the contrary, by alluding to King Richard solely as "künec von Engellant" and never referring to him by name, Ulrich implies that at the time he wrote the epilogue to his Lanzelet Richard was still alive, and since Richard was killed in the spring of 1199 one can reasonably speculate that the Lanzelet must have been completed prior to that date. Besides, the epilogue to the Lanzelet (particularly v. 9338-9347) appears to say that Ulrich had gained access to the "welschez buoch" and had begun translating it even before December 1194[26] when Hugh de Morville returned to England.[27] The textual evidence therefore fails to support those critics who maintain that Ulrich waited several years after becoming acquainted with the Urlanzelet before he commenced translating it and instead lends credence to Gruhn's conjecture[28] that Ulrich began writing his epic immediately upon gaining access to the "welschez buoch". However, Ulrich's words in the epilogue to the Lanzelet, (v. 9338-9341) which seem to imply that Hugh de Morville either was no longer in possession of the Urlanzelet or no longer within the bounds of the Holy

Roman Empire when these lines were penned, stand at variance with and discredit Gruhn's contention[29] that Hugh de Morville would never have given away or carelessly left behind such a valuable manuscript as the Urlanzelet and that Ulrich was consequently forced to work as rapidly as possible in order to translate his source before Hugh returned to England taking it with him. Thus the exact date of composition of the Lanzelet is uncertain, although the available data suggest that the poem was written within the time span 1194-1199.

Another MHG author who provides information about the date of composition of his works is Wolfram von Eschenbach, who by his reference in Parzival to horses trampling the vineyards of Erfurt recalls the siege of that city in the summer of 1203:

> Erffurter wîngarte giht
> von treten noch der selben nôt:
> maneg orses fuoz die slâge bôt. (Parz. 379, 18-20)[30]

Since Wolfram remarks that the vineyards still bear the marks of this siege, these lines could have been written no earlier than the fall of 1203 and no later than 1205 by which time peace had been concluded between the warring parties and cultivation of the vineyards could have been resumed.[31] However, because Wolfram's allusion to Erfurt appears midway through Parzival in Book VII, it is impossible to calculate a precise terminus ante quo or terminus ad quem for the work as a whole, although scholars generally concur that Wolfram began his epic no sooner than 1199 at the earliest, which would place it after Ulrich's Lanzelet in the relative chronology of the MHG Arthurian epic.

Nonetheless, Wolfram's reference to the siege of Erfurt is of great value because it also allows the critic to date some of Hartmann's epics which are mentioned in the earlier books of Parzival, for by alluding to

"Hartmann von Ouwe" and "Enîde" in Book III (Parz. 143, 21-30) and to "Lûneten rât" in Book V (Parz. 253, 10-14) Wolfram intimates that Hartmann had already completed Erec and Iwein by the time these lines were penned.[32] As a result, the latest possible date of completion for Erec and Iwein falls in the year 1204 although, because many critics feel that the end of Book VI of Parzival marks a hiatus in Wolfram's work during which the author may have actively participated in the war between the emperor and Landgrave Hermann of Thuringia, it is possible that Wolfram composed Books I to VI of his epic before the conflict began. Thus Books III to V of Parzival may have been composed in 1202, which would mean that Iwein and Erec had been finished by Hartmann by this time as well.[33]

Unfortunately Hartmann's epics themselves offer the reader no direct allusions to historical events and therefore provide the scholar with very little information about the absolute date of their composition, yet for years researchers have insisted on piecing together ambiguous clues from Hartmann's various works in an effort to reconstruct his life's story and establish the date of composition of his individual epics. One such clue, which some critics have utilised to support their contention that Hartmann composed his Erec prior to 1189, when the Third Crusade began, is furnished by Hartmann's reference in Erec to sable fur from "Connelant" (Iconium) (Erec v. 2000-2011).[34] Hartmann states that:

> Conne beslozzen lît
> zwischen den landen beiden,
> den Kriechen und den heiden. (Erec v. 2007-2009)

This prompts Neumann to claim that, because these lines imply that at the time of their writing Iconium was not yet considered a heathen state, they could only have been written before 1190, since prior to that date the sultan of Iconium was bound to the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I by a

treaty of friendship and had even evinced a willingness to convert to Christianity, whereas after 1190 Iconium would have been accounted a heathen state due to its hostile reception of the crusaders in that year.[35]

Neumann then further asserts that no MHG author writing after 1190 would have been so crass and tactless as to mention the name of Iconium in connection with a joyous occasion such as the wedding described in this context in Erec, since after the Third Crusade the name of that city would presumably have been inextricably linked in the minds of the German public with Barbarossa's tragic death and the subsequent dissolution of the imperial army.[36] Schröder therefore maintains that Hartmann's Erec must have been composed before these events occurred.[37]

However, these arguments are seriously flawed. Schröder, for example, errs by assuming that Iconium, which had been completely subjugated by the crusaders in 1190, would thereafter have been considered just another heathen state,[38] when instead Barbarossa's conquest of the city in 1190 would in all likelihood have further confirmed the special status of Iconium in the minds of the German public. Moreover, it could easily be that Schröder is reading too much into this passage, a mistake which Neumann himself cautions against,[39] for, strictly speaking, Iconium was just as much a heathen state before 1190 as it was after that date, since the sultan never did convert to Christianity.

Even less viable than this latter argument, meanwhile, is Neumann's assertion that Hartmann would never have referred to Iconium while depicting the wedding scene in Erec if he had composed the latter after 1190, for Neumann mistakenly assumes that the name Iconium would have been remembered by the German public primarily in connection with Barbarossa's death and would therefore have been connotative of grief and sorrow,[40]

when the truth of the matter is that Barbarossa died, not at Iconium, where he won a crucial victory that represented the high point and only significant success of the campaign, but in Armenia. Consequently, a MHG author writing some years after Barbarossa's passing when the pain of the monarch's death would have been somewhat assuaged would have had good reason to include an allusion to Iconium in his portrayal of a joyous occasion such as Erec's wedding to Enite, since Iconium would have been associated in the minds of his readers with Barbarossa's last great victory rather than with his death. Thus Neumann's and Schröder's arguments demonstrably rest on false premises and their conclusions can be dismissed for lack of supporting evidence.

Rosenhagen, on the other hand, makes a useful observation when he points out that if Hartmann himself had participated in the Third Crusade and had been present at the sacking of Iconium he would not thereafter have spontaneously referred to sable from "Connelant," since he probably would have learned during his stay in Iconium that sable is not a product of that region and never has been.[41] Therefore if it could be proved that Hartmann took part in the Third Crusade, as many scholars believe he did, then one would have to conclude that Hartmann's Erec was likely composed prior to 1190.

However, the possibility that Hartmann went on this crusade seems to be precluded by two lines in Hartmann's crusading song "Ich var mit iuweren hulden" (MF. 218, 5):

> und lebte min her Salatîn und al sîn her
> dien braehten mich von Vranken niemer einen vuoz. (MF. 218, 18f.)

The use of the subjunctive in these verses implies that Saladin was already deceased at the time of their writing. Since Saladin died in 1193 it would necessarily follow that this poem was written after that date and

that the speaker's stated intention of going on a crusade could only have been fulfilled during the crusade of 1197, not the Third Crusade,[42] a conclusion which is supported by the fact that the German knights taking part in the former crusade, unlike those participating in the latter, gathered in Franconia before setting out for the Holy Land, which would explain Hartmann's reference to "Vranken."[43]

Yet a number of scholars are not satisfied with the manuscript reading of these lines. Carl von Kraus, for example, objects to the use of "mîn her" in this context, claiming that this form of address is employed by the MHG authors of this era solely to express either sympathy with the subject of address or, when it is used ironically, antipathy, which is supposedly not the case in Hartmann's poem.[44] Sparnaay, however, points out that the phrase "mîn her" appears time and again in Hartmann's works where no such connotation of sympathy or antipathy is apparent[45] while other critics such as Panzer[46] and Jungbluth[47] feel that Hartmann fully intended the words "mîn her" to express irony here.

Kraus further maintains that the manuscript reading is unacceptable because the syntax of these lines as they stand in the manuscript would require that the reference to Saladin's army "und al sîn her" be understood to mean that not Saladin alone, but his whole army had perished by the time these verses were written, something which was definitely not the case.[48] Sparnaay rightly rejects this view, pointing out that the use of the subjunctive verb "lebte" suggests only that not all of Saladin's host remained alive at this time but does not, as Kraus claims, presuppose the death of each individual soldier in it although, if one insists on conceiving of Saladin's army as a unit or as an entity in itself, then the dissolution of that army after Saladin's death could also be considered as

the termination of its existence. Moreover, because the author of this verse is seeking to focus the reader's attention on Saladin's might and since the army mentioned can be regarded as the symbol and embodiment of Saladin's power, the verse in question should not be interpreted too literally,[49] for the army here serves merely as an appendage or adjunct to Saladin himself. Kraus is therefore guilty of splitting hairs in his attempts to discredit the manuscript reading of these lines.

Meanwhile other critics contend that the manuscript reading is unsatisfactory because the speaker in this poem, although he is presumably going on a crusade to wrest the Holy Land back from the infidels, nevertheless states that Saladin and his army could never have drawn him to leave Franconia. The speaker's comment therefore seems to be inconsistent with his purpose of fighting the Saracens.[50] However, the alleged inconsistency disappears if one admits the possibility that the speaker intends to go on a pilgrimage rather than on a crusade or if one assumes, as some scholars do, that the speaker goes crusading at the behest of his lady love[51] as is the case in Hartmann's song "Swelch vrowe sendet ir lieben man" (MF 211, 20) or is motivated to go on a crusade by his love for God rather than by the desire for fame or the thirst for action.[52] Thus this poem can be interpreted in such a way as to accommodate the manuscript reading and still make sense.

Nonetheless, many critics have insisted on proposing various emendations of the manuscript which would completely change the meaning of the controversial lines and eliminate the implication that Saladin was dead at the time of their writing. One of the first such modifications of the pertinent verses was introduced by the brothers Grimm, who punctuate them as follows:

lebte min her, Salatin und al sin her
die enbrehten mich von Franken nimer einen fûs.[53]

By inserting this punctuation they imply that Hartmann was here referring to the death of his lord which he had alluded to in the peom "Dem kriuze zimet wol reiner muot" (MF 209, 25). Yet such a reading of these lines overlooks the fact that "her", the abbreviated form of "herre", is employed by MHG authors almost exclusively in unaccented position either as a form of address somewhat like the French "monsieur" or in combination with a proper name (e.g. "min her Iwein, her Gawein") and would not be utilised to denote "Lehnsherr", as the brothers Grimm imply it must,[54] particularly since the comma preceding "Saladin" necessitates a shift in stress in the line which, since it would result in an accent falling on both the first and second "her" in the line, would, because of the repeated emphasis on "her", produce an unpleasant and undesirable effect[55] uncharacteristic of Hartmann. Thus it is not surprising that subsequent scholars, with the exception of Leitzmann,[56] fail to endorse the emendation proposed by the brothers Grimm.

The suggestion of the brothers Grimm did, however, inspire Paul to further modify the manuscript to read:

und lebt mîn herre, Salatîn und al sîn her.[57]

Yet by taking the necessary step of emending "her" to the longer form "herre" Paul is forced by the exigencies of the meter to simultaneously elide the final "e" of "lebte", producing an unattractive apocope uncharacteristic of Hartmann[58] and rendering the subjunctive verb indistinguishable from its indicative counterpart, a questionable procedure.[59] Moreover, Paul's proposed emendation of this verse, like that of the brothers Grimm, has the unpleasant result of producing an accent on each of the homonymous words, "herre" and "her". Therefore, since it is unlikely that a meticulous craftsman such as Hartmann would

have composed substandard verse like this line attributed to him by Paul, the manuscript reading must clearly be given preference.[60]

An even more telling objection to Paul's version of this verse is raised by Vogt, who points out that Paul's emendation creates severe problems for the interpretation of the song as a whole, for if the speaker in this poem has been inspired to take the cross chiefly by his love for God, as the critics who adopt Paul's reading of the controversial line generally maintain,[61] then it would make no sense for him to state that, despite Saladin's threat to the Holy Land, he himself would never have left Franconia if his lord were still alive, since such a statement would contradict and detract from his claim that love is the sole, allpowerful force urging him to go on this crusade.[62] On the other hand, one cannot argue, as does Kraus, that the love motivating the speaker to take part in a crusade was his love for his dead lord which had led him to swear an oath to go crusading after the latter's death,[63] for in the third stanza of "Ich var mit iuweren hulden" (MF 218, 5) the speaker clearly declares that his love is presently being returned by the object of his affections, which therefore cannot be the ubiquitous lord, since the latter is already dead.

Stolte, to be sure, contends that the incongruity caused by Paul's emendation is due to a mistranslation of the crucial verses and suggests that the initial "und" (MF. 218, 219) is to be translated as "when" while the verb "enbraehten" in the following line is to be understood as a pluperfect in order to produce the translation; "when my lord was still alive, Saladin and his whole army would not have been able to draw me a single foot away from Franconia."[64] However, given the syntax of these verses, Stolte's translation of "und" as "when" is highly improbable and

reflects poorly on Hartmann's literary skills while Stolte's interpretation of the verb as a pluperfect is impossible because it would imply that Hartmann was no longer in Franconia when he wrote these lines, whereas Hartmann's song clearly indicates that he had not yet departed but was merely preparing to leave.

Saran, meanwhile, suggests that these contradictions inherent in Paul's version of the poem can be eliminated by interpreting the word "minne" differently in each stanza; first as love for a woman, then as love for a friend, and lastly as love for God.[65] Yet this interpretation destroys the unity of the poem and is untenable because Hartmann gives no indication that the meaning of "minne" is intended to vary within the song and furnishes no clues as to where the alleged transitions in meaning take place, although such guidelines would be imperative if the word "minne" were to be employed in as ambiguous a fashion as Saran suggests.

Consequently, it is obvious that Paul's modification of the manuscript reading, instead of simplifying the interpretation of this song, unneccesarily complicates it by introducing irreconcilable contradictions into the poem and hence must, like the even more radical, poorly founded emendations of this controversial line proposed by other critics such as Jungbluth, who emends the word "lebte" in the controversial line to "letzte,"[66] be discarded as unsatisfactory and implausible. Thus one must accept the manuscript reading of the verse in question and as a result must conclude that Hartmann, if he ever really did go on a crusade -- for despite the absence of non-literary historical records indicating Hartmann's participation in a crusade, literary scholars have nevertheless assumed, firstly, that the speaker in Hartmann's poems is identical with the author himself, secondly, that

Hartmann's poems reflect events in his personal life, and thirdly, that Hartmann's alleged intention, expressed in "Dem kriuze zimet wol reiner muot" (MF. 209, 25), of taking part in a crusade was actually fulfilled, although the poet himself never reflects back on such participation in his later works[67] -- took part, not in the Third Crusade, but in the crusade of 1197. But if this is the case, then the efforts of those critics such as Neumann, who predicated his arguments that Hartmann composed his Erec prior to 1190 on the premise that the author himself participated in the Third Crusade or intended to do so, are vain and their arguments are worthless. In summary, then, despite the claims of some scholars, analysis of the few allusions to historical events in Hartmann's works reveals nothing conclusive about the exact dates of origin of Hartmann's four epics.

Thus the technique of correlating remarks in an author's own works with non-literary historical records in order to date the former also has its limitations and other means must therefore be found to determine when many of these medieval German epics were written.

D. Dating the Lanzelet through Parallels to Other Literary Works

One such alternative method for establishing the relative dates of composition of MHG epics is based on the observation that many of these works contain parallel passages, utilise analogous motifs and/or employ similar proper names for various characters and locales, all of which implies that the authors of some of these epics had a tendency to borrow material from their literary predecessors. The difficulty here mainly consists in ascertaining which of the poets in question borrowed from the other, seldom an easy task. Nevertheless, if it can be shown that verses

In the Lanzelet, for example, reproduce passages in such works as Hartmann's Erec or Wolfram's Parzival where the latter poets faithfully translate lines in the corresponding works by Chrétien, then, unless the similarities could plausibly be attributed to a link between Chrétien's epics and the Urlanzelet or to borrowing directly from Chrétien's works by Ulrich, it logically follows that Ulrich borrowed such verses from Hartmann or Wolfram, whose earlier epics consequently must have antedated the Lanzelet. On the other hand, if it can be demonstrated that passages in the Lanzelet which have close analogues in the CdlC and/or the French Prose Lancelot and therefore must have been derived directly from the Urlanzelet, the archetype of the Lancelot legend, are parallel to verses in Wolfram's Parzival and Hartmann's works solely where these latter authors deviate from their ultimate sources, Chrétien's Erec, Ivain, and Perceval, then one can assume that Hartmann and Wolfram drew on the Lanzelet for material and that the latter must be the older MHG epic. Naturally, essentially the same rationale applies where the Lanzelet and another work share a number of common motifs or consistently utilise the same repertoire of Arthurian names.

Unfortunately, the majority of critics refuse to follow such a logical procedure for resolving which author is the borrower and which the lender, and instead simply tabulate all the parallels they can find between the Lanzelet and some other MHG epic and then arbitrarily declare that Ulrich must have borrowed the shared features from the latter.

1. The Lanzelet and Wirnt's Wigalois

This, for example, is the course taken by M. O'C Walshe, who claims that Ulrich borrowed material from Wirnt von Grafenberg's Wigalois.

Walshe alleges that Ulrich's reference to a "messenger" from Karidol who describes the events which occurred at Kardigan (Lanz. v. 4969-5030) is modelled after Wirnt's depiction of the messenger from Karidol in Wigalois (Wig. v. 1416-1434), since both authors use the same form of the city's name and since Ulrich's account is illogical in that the trial by combat between the queen's champion and Valerin is to take place at Kardigan, where the events described by the messenger transpired, although the messenger himself brings the news from Karidol, a different city altogether. Therefore, because no such inconsistency appears in Wigalois, where the messenger's provenance is referred to in almost identical words, Walshe asserts that Ulrich must have borrowed this passage from Wirnt.[68]

However, Walshe's argument is seriously flawed because it rests on the unwarranted assumption that, like the garzûn in Wigalois, the valet who encounters the hero in Ulrich's epic has been sent out from Karidol for the express purpose of informing those he meets with a message about the upcoming contest, whereas the Lanzelet (v. 4970-4974) nowhere suggests that the valet is anything other than a simple wayfarer passing on the latest gossip which he had heard in Karidol to the chance-met traveller, Lancelot. Thus there is no indication that the messenger in the Lanzelet is an errand-boy sent out from Karidol like the garzûn in Wigalois. Moreover, because Karidol is mentioned several times in the Lanzelet before the reference to the valet crops up, this reference cannot be considered out of character or inappropriate to the context as Walshe would imply it is.[69] Seen in this light, Ulrich's allusion to Karidol embodies no true inconsistency, a circumstance which deprives Walshe's argument of all its force and leaves the possibility open that Wirnt derived his reference to the messenger from Karidol from the Lanzelet, for

the coincidence that Ulrich, Wirnt, and Hartmann all spell the name Karidol in identical fashion proves nothing about the relative dates of composition of their respective works.

Singer's allegation that Ulrich's reference to the Eren steine, "von dem ist iu gesaget gnuoc" (Lanz. v. 5179), must comprise an allusion to Wirnt's epic, where this stone is also mentioned (Wig. v. 1477-1505)[70], is likewise based on a false premise since Singer mistakenly assumes that Ulrich's words presuppose the existence of another work which alludes to the stone, whereas Ulrich typically uses such formulaic phrases as fillers to supply the requisite rhyme. Moreover, the syntax of this passage (Lanz. v. 5177-5183) requires that the words of l.5179 be considered merely as a preamble to the succeeding two verses. More importantly, however, even if one should accept Singer's interpretation of these lines, one must reject the possibility that Ulrich's comment represents an allusion to Wigalois, for Ulrich's words in ll.5177f of the Lanzelet, where Gawain is depicted sitting on the "Eren steine," stand in sharp contradiction to ll.1506-1517 of Wigalois where Wirnt gives a detailed explanation as to why Gawain is incapable of sitting on the stone but can at best merely touch it with an outstretched hand. Since it is inconceivable that Ulrich should have borrowed the motif of the stone from Wigalois while simultaneously ignoring and/or contradicting Wirnt's statements about it, Singer's declaration that Ulrich must have drawn material from Wirnt's work must be rejected as unsubstantiated speculation.

On the other hand, when one compares the parallel passages in the two works one finds evidence to support Bauer's contention that Ulrich's Lanzelet antedated Wigalois,[71] for the brief aside in the Lanzelet about the violent disapproval which threatened a lady who dared ride unescorted

through the countryside (Lanz. v. 2326-2331) corresponds not only to a somewhat longer discourse on the same topic in Wigalois (v. 2356-2381), but has an analogue in the CdlC as well and therefore must have been integral to the Urlanzelet and the Lancelot legend. Since the passages in both MHG epics coincide closely in their contrast of the "good old days," when young damsels could ride unescorted through the land without fear of reproach, with the present times when such behavior would be inadvisable, one can safely conclude that Wirnt borrowed these ideas from the Lanzelet, which consequently must have antedated Wigalois, a conclusion, the accuracy of which is further confirmed by the fact that Wirnt portrays the "künic von Engellant", a non-Arthurian figure, as one of the sponsors of a tournament with Arthur (Wig. v. 1446), a reference which could well be intended as an allusion to the Lanzelet where the king of England is also mentioned. Thus the available evidence fails to support the theory that Wigalois was composed prior to the Lanzelet and instead points to the Lanzelet as the older work.

2. The Lanzelet and Wolfram's Parzival

No more convincing than Walshe's assertion that Wigalois is older than the Lanzelet are the claims of those critics who assert that Ulrich borrowed considerable material from Wolfram's Parzival. Leitzmann, for example, cites as practically the sole evidence for his allegation that Ulrich emulated Wolfram the fact that these two authors in their respective epics frequently utilise similar or identical Arthurian names[72] such as:

Lanzelet	Parzival
Karjet (Lanz. 3188)	Gaherjet (Parz. 664,30)
Kailet (Lanz. 6032)	Kaylet (Parz. 58, 29)

Lanzelet	Parzival
Iblis and Iweret (Lanz. 4656, 4741)	Iblis and Ibert (Parz. 656, 3-657, 23)
Iwan de Nonel (W) or von Lonel (P) (Lanz. 2936)	Iwan von Nonel (Parz. 234, 12)
Johfrit de Liez (Lanz. 487)	Jofreit fiz Idoel (Parz. 311, 6)
Gurnemanz (Lanz. 2630)	Gurnemanz de Graharz or Gurnamanz (Parz. 68, 22; 188, 16)
Galagandreiz (W) or Galagadruweiz (P) (Lanz. 734)	Galogandres (Parz. 205, 9)
Ramuret (Lanz. 9016)	Gahmuret or Gamuret (Parz. 5, 23)
Maurin (Lanz. 3052)	Maurin (Parz. 662, 19)
Djofle (W) or Joifle (P) (Lanz. 2670)	Joflanze or Schoflanze or Tschofflanze (Parz. 610, 23)
Thile (Lanz. 7991)	Thiler (Parz. 770, 20)
Isalden (Lanz. 8093)	Isalden (Parz. 187, 19)
Pluris (Lanz. 448)	Prurin (Parz. 134, 12)
Dodines (Lanz. 7098)	Dodines (Parz. 271, 13)
Upandagron (P) or Urprandagon (W) (Lanz. 6734)	Utepandragun, Utrepandragun, Utpandragun, Uterpandragun, Upandragun or Urpandragun (Parz. 56, 12; 74, 6; 314, 23)
grave Ritschart (Lanz. 3130)	kuns Ritschart (Parz. 665,7)

In actuality, however, the parallels between the proper names utilised by the two authors in their works furnish no proof that Ulrich borrowed material from Wolfram since few of the names used by Wolfram are replicated exactly in the Lanzelet and since most of the names in Parzival either have no antecedents in Chrétien's Perceval or do not resemble closely the names in Chrétien's epic with which they are related. Moreover, some Arthurian names found in both the Lanzelet and Parzival appear in other epics as well and could consequently originally have been

derived from these sources rather than from Wolfram's Parzival. Thus, unless an Arthurian name appears among early MHG epics exclusively in the Lanzelet and Parzival, is spelled in identical fashion in both works, and can also be traced back to its origins in Chrétien's Perceval, there is no valid reason to assume that Ulrich borrowed the pertinent name from Wolfram. Interestingly, not a single name among those cited meets all these criteria.

On the other hand, evidence does exist which indicates that Wolfram may have borrowed some proper names from the Lanzelet. Rosenfeld, for example, points out that the reference to Maurin "mit den liehten schenkeln" in the Lanzelet (v. 3052) is consonant with Ulrich's habit of attaching descriptive epithets to the names of Arthurian knights whereas the parallel passage "mit den schoenen schenkeln Maurîn" in Parzival (662, 19) is atypical of Wolfram's style, since, as Richter himself admits,[73] Wolfram nowhere else qualifies the names of his characters in this fashion.[74] Moreover, it is noteworthy that the verse in Parzival alliterates while its counterpart in the Lanzelet does not, and since an imitator would be unlikely to adapt his source in such a way as to eliminate the poetic plus of alliteration, it therefore seems inescapable that Wolfram borrowed the line in question from Ulrich and then improved upon it.

An even clearer indication that Wolfram extracted names from the Lanzelet for his Parzival is furnished by a comparison of the two authors' versions of the Arthurian name which appears in Chrétien's Erec as "Yvains de Loenel (Erec v. 1707). The original reading is retained by Ulrich in Manuscript P (identified by Hahn as the more reliable manuscript[75]) of the Lanzelet as "Iwan von Lonel" (Lanz. v. 2936) and by Hartmann in Erec as

"Îwân von Lônel" (Erec v. 1643) while the less accurate Manuscript W of the Lanzelet yields the variant reading "Iwân de Nônel," which closely resembles Wolfram's version of the name in Parzival, "Iwân von Nônel." Although it is possible that the aberrant versions of the name in Parzival and in Manuscript W of the Lanzelet could have arisen independently of each other due to misreading of a source Manuscript by both Wolfram and a copyist of Manuscript W of the Lanzelet, it is just as likely that only the reading in manuscript W is attributable to scribal error and that Wolfram then perpetuated the aberrant reading so produced by borrowing the misspellt name from the archetype of Manuscript W of Ulrich's epic. In any case, it is certain that Ulrich could not have borrowed this name from Wolfram.

Additional evidence that Wolfram may have copied names from Ulrich's Lanzelet is provided by Jean Fourquet, who observes that the name "Giôt" in the Lanzelet (v. 8154 ff.) closely resembles Wolfram's Kyot, the name of the alleged Provencal author of the source of Parzival (416, 20 ff.). According to Fourquet, Wolfram's reference to Kyot comprises an ironic allusion to Ulrich's Giot, who, although described as a competent orator, leaves all the talking to his companion, Iwan. The implication is that the enigmatic Kyot was actually no more talkative than Ulrich's orator and hence did not really exist but was a fictitious character to whom Wolfram could safely ascribe his own literary inventions.[76] To be sure, Fourquet's theory is highly speculative but such plays on words and veiled allusions to other works are not uncommon in Wolfram's works, as is evidenced by passages reflecting Wolfram's literary feud with Gottfried von Strassburg. Consequently Fourquet's hypothesis may have some merit.

More importantly, however, it can be demonstrated that parallels between certain names shared by the Lanzelet and Parzival cannot by any

means be attributed to borrowing from the latter by Ulrich. For example, although the similarity between Wolfram's "kuns Ritschart de Nâvers" (Parz. 665, 7) and Ulrich's "grâve Ritschart von Tumâne" (Lanz. v. 3130) extends even to the fact that both knights oppose Arthur's troops in a tournament, the two authors completely disagree in their depiction of the outcome of the tournament. According to Ulrich, with the help of Lancelot Ritschart wins the day, whereas in Parzival after initial successes Ritschart is captured by Arthur. Since Ulrich's description of Ritschart with his hundred knights coincides in many respects with the depiction of the King of a hundred knights in the French Prose Lancelot it follows that such a character also appeared in the Urlanzelet.[77] Therefore, if this parallel between the Lanzelet and Parzival is to be attributed to borrowing, one can only assume that Wolfram borrowed the name and character from the Lanzelet while revising Ulrich's account.

Likewise, the correspondence between the names "Iblis" and "Iweret" in the Lanzelet and "Iblis" and "Ibert" in Parzival cannot be ascribed to borrowing from the latter by Ulrich, since the portrayal of the characters associated with these names differs so greatly in the two works and since Lot,[78] Philipot,[79] and Brugger[80] have tentatively identified Ulrich's Iweret with the Evrain and Irayn which play a similar role in conjunction with Mabons or Mabuz in the various versions of the "Bel Inconnu" legend, thereby implying that Iweret already had this name in the Urlanzelet. As Singer remarks, in this case the parallels are probably due to a link between the Urlanzelet and Wolfram's source, which may have both drawn on an older epic or lay for material.[81] Thus the similarities between proper names utilised in both the Lanzelet and Parzival in and of themselves do little to elucidate the relationship between these poems, but when they do

give some indication of the priority of one epic over another then they point to the Lanzelet as the earlier work.

Basically the same situation prevails where the Lanzelet and Parzival evince common motifs, for although critics such as Cosman[82] and Singer[83] have attempted to employ these shared motifs as evidence that Ulrich excerpted material from Wolfram's Parzival, their arguments are subject to serious flaws.

Singer, for example, suggests that the depiction of Ade's horse in the Lanzelet (Lanz. v. 1452 ff.)[84] is modelled after the ironic portrayal of Jeschute's horse in Wolfram's epic, (Parz. 256, 17ff.)[84] but the two passages differ considerably in their tone and Richter rightly objects that the description of a horse is a motif which recurs in a number of Old French epics and therefore need not have been borrowed from Parzival.[85]

Weston, on the other hand, has some grounds for her claim that Ulrich patterned his depiction of Lancelot as a Dümmling after Wolfram's description of Parzival's youthful ignorance, for both heroes are nameless and do not know how to sit a horse, use a bridle or hold their weapons properly.[86] Singer, who concurs with Weston, notices an additional parallel between the Lanzelet and Parzival with regard to the Dümmlingssage, namely that in each work a bystander ascribes the hero's clumsiness not to ignorance, but to the hero's performance of a feat of Minnedienst for his lady, and observes that the Dümmlingssage was probably not an integral part of the Urlanzelet since the French Prose Lancelot has no trace of it.[87]

Cosman identifies even more correspondences between the two epics, noting firstly, that in both works the (foster) mother of the hero informs him of a wrong done her that needs to be avenged, and secondly that in

both Parzival and the Lanzelet the hero receives a horse, clothing, and advice from his (foster) mother. Cosman attributes these features in the Lanzelet to borrowing from Wolfram by Ulrich,[88] although these same events are described in Chrétien's Perceval and, more importantly, in the French Prose Lancelot, which parallels the Lanzelet more closely here than does Parzival, so that their presence in the latter two MHG epics therefore need not be ascribed to imitation of the one author by the other.

Likewise Cosman explains Ulrich's account of Lancelot's instruction in equestrian skills and in the martial arts by Johfrit as an imitation of Wolfram's portrayal of Parzival's education by Gurnemanz, in spite of the fact that basically the same motif appears in Chrétien's Perceval and that the Lanzelet and Parzival disagree strongly in their depiction of details, as she herself is forced to admit.[89]

Nevertheless, Cosman claims that the many correspondences between the latter epics could only be due to borrowing from Wolfram by Ulrich since the Dümmlingssage and the account of the hero's education are integral to the Perceval legend and permeate Wolfram's epic where they furnish the dominant theme, but are foreign to the Lancelot legend where they are practically dead motifs that play a role only in the early stages in the plot of the Lanzelet.[90]

However, recent studies have shown that Cosman's evaluation of the role played in the Lanzelet by the Dümmlingssage and by the theme of the hero's education is false, for Schüppert[91] and Schmidt[92] have demonstrated that Lancelot only gradually acquires the skills of knightly combat in Ulrich's epic by encountering progressively more formidable opponents in battle. Lancelot's development stands in marked contrast to the hero's development as a warrior in Parzival, where the hero's instruction in the

martial arts by Gurnemanz instantly transforms him into an invincible champion and where no further evolution of Parzival as a warrior takes place. Consequently these motifs seem more appropriate to the setting of the Lanzelet than to that of Parzival and, since it is precisely in their depiction of the youthful hero's ignorance of knightly skills such as riding and jousting that the two epics deviate from Chrétien's Perceval and coincide most closely with each other,[93] Cosman's claims are to a large extent invalidated, for her own arguments about the suitability of these motifs to their context can be used against her.

The same holds true for some of the other parallels between the Lanzelet and Parzival adduced by Cosman as proof that Ulrich imitated Wolfram, for if one follows the rationale she employs, then the fact that both Ulrich and Wolfram have the (foster) mother of the hero of their respective works inform him of an injury done her that calls for vengeance and that both authors desribe how a bystander mistakes the hero's equestrian clumsiness for a feat of courtly love demanded of him by a lady can be taken to prove that Wolfram borrowed material from Ulrich, for these motifs perform an important function in the Lanzelet, either in foreshadowing the hero's encounter with Iweret in which he avenges his foster mother and discovers his identity as a reward or in illustrating the theme of love which dominates Ulrich's whole epic, but are superfluous in Parzival where Herzeloyde's action in informing Parzival of the wrongs done him by Lähelin that call for vengeance seems irreconcilable with her concern for her son's safety, where Parzival never does take revenge on Lähelin, and where love is at best a subsidiary theme. It is therefore more likely that Wolfram copied Ulrich than that Ulrich borrowed material from Parzival.

Interestingly, Cosman herself in an attempt to demonstrate Ulrich's dependence on Wolfram points out a parallel between their epics which can be utilised to buttress the argument that Wolfram borrowed from Ulrich when she notes that Lancelot's mother in the Lanzelet, Clarine, like Herzeloyde in Parzival, differs from the majority of matrons depicted in MHG literature by personally suckling her son instead of assigning this responsibility to a nurse,[94] for the very same action is attributed to Lancelot's mother in the Old French Vulgate Merlin[95] whereas no such feature appears in Chrétien's Perceval.

Weston, meanwhile, suggests that the correspondence between Ulrich's depiction of Iweret in the Lanzelet and Wolfram's portrayal of Karnahkarnanz in Parzival furnishes another indication that Ulrich borrowed from Parzival:[96]

> des selben einen wâfenroc
> fuort er und guldîn schellen dran.
> er schein ein engel, niht ein man. (Lanz. v. 4428 ff.)
>
> den dûhter als ein got getân:
> ern hete sô liehtes niht erkant.
> ûfem touwe dèr wâpenroc erwant.
> mit guldîn schellen kleine
> vor iewederm beine
> wârn die stegreife erklenget
> unt ze rehter mâze erlenget.
> sîn zeswer arm von schellen klanc,
> swar ern bôt oder swanc. (Parz. 121, 30 - 122, 8)

Yet when one examines the two passages closely and compares them with Chrétien's version of the Karnahkarnanz episode as it stands in Perceval (v. 1340-1350), one finds that Ulrich, by likening Iweret to an angel, corresponds more closely to Chrétien than to Wolfram, who deviates from Chrétien by comparing the splendidly accoutred knights encountered by the youthful hero not to angels, but to gods, although it must be noted that both Ulrich and Wolfram differ from Chrétien by mentioning that the

knight's harness or that of his horse is caparisoned with tiny golden bells, a parallel which is, however, inexact and which could be due to borrowing by either author or by neither.

On the other hand, numerous episodes and motifs in the Lanzelet which have analogues in the CdlC and as a result must be considered original components of the Urlanzelet also have parallels in Parzival and/or Peredur but not in Chrétien's Perceval, a circumstance which suggests that these correspondences may be ascribable to imitation of the Lanzelet by Wolfram or to a link between the Urlanzelet and Wolfram's sources exclusive of Chrétien's Perceval (if any). The Pluris episode in the Lanzelet, for example, which is related to the Empress of Constantinople episode in Peredur and to the amorous jaileress episodes in the CdlC and French Prose Lancelot, is also closely linked to the episode in Parzival where Gahmuret wins a tournament and is thereby forced into marriage with Herzeloyde much as Lancelot is forced to marry the queen of Pluris after defeating her hundred knights. Indeed, by making a habit of loving and leaving various ladies (Anflise, Belakane, Herzeloyde), Gahmuret behaves much like Ulrich's Weiberheld, Lancelot, who also wins the hearts of several ladies and then deserts them. Thus the evidence clearly indicates either that Wolfram borrowed motifs from the Lanzelet or that both Wolfram's source and the Urlanzelet drew on a lost source for the material common to their MHG successors.

Nonetheless, some critics maintain that Parzival antedated the Lanzelet and allege that the parallel passages and stylistic similarities in these epics furnish proof that this is the case. Weston, for example, draws attention to verses in the Lanzelet and Parzival which similarly describe the commencement of a tournament:

engegen der vespereide
riten über jene heide
dort zwêne, dâ her drî.
etslich tôre was dâ bî. (Lanz. v. 2855 ff.)

sich huop diu vesperîe sân.
hie riten sehse, dort wol drî:
den fuor vil lîhte ein tropel bî. (Parz. 68, 24-26)

Weston quickly concludes that Ulrich must have adopted the passage in question from Wolfram's epic,[97] whereby she overlooks a passage in Hartmann's Erec which betrays a distinct kinship to both Ulrich's and Wolfram's verses:

nû huop sich ouch sâ
vil rîch diu vespereide
enmitten ûf der heide. (Erec v. 2453 ff.)

Yet because the lines in the Lanzelet introduce the three days' tournament motif which was integral to the Urlanzelet, whereas the verses in Hartmann's Erec and Wolfram's Parzival are found in sections of those epics where the authors are not following Chrétien, it is clear that if any version of this passage is to be considered the original, then it is that of the Lanzelet, for no other criterion exists whereby one could determine which of these authors copied the other(s).

Meanwhile, the correspondences between these two works which Richter lists consist mainly of common MHG proverbs or of unusual syntactic structures such as Ulrich's antithetical statement "die frumen, niht die boesen" (Lanz. v. 7568), which resembles various verses in Parzival in that the latter exhibit the same antithetical structure.[98] Yet such verses could have originated with either author, for Richter's designation of a particular phrase in the Lanzelet as typically "Wolframisch" is misleading if, as is usually the case, such turns of phrase appear frequently in the Lanzelet as well. One could just as easily describe some of Wolfram's verses as "Ulrichisch" and with equal justification.

Richter, moreover, is unreasonable when he implies that because Ulrich restricts his use of circumlocutions to identify the hero to the first half of the Lanzelet, such a stylistic feature must have been borrowed from Parzival where such circumlocutions are more common, for Richter himself accounts for this discrepancy in the Lanzelet by pointing out that Ulrich was forced to use circumlocutions in referring to his hero because the latter was nameless until midway through the Lanzelet,[99] after which point the employment of circumlocutions to identify him would no longer have been necessary.

Finally, Richter points out how close Ulrich's contact with the first books of Parzival is[100] and notes that the correspondences between the Lanzelet and Parzival in the utilisation of rhyme words are essentially restricted to the first few books of Parzival and then accounts for this by postulating that Ulrich was acquainted solely with the beginning of Wolfram's epic.[101] Yet Richter ignores an equally valid explanation for these discrepancies, namely that Wolfram at the commencement of his career as an epicist used the Lanzelet as a source of material and as a literary model but then gradually developed his own style as he began to employ Chrétien's Perceval as his primary source after completing Book II of Parzival. Since only this explanation satisfactorily accounts for the existence of numerous parallels between the Lanzelet and some of the later books of Parzival, it must take precedence over Richter's untenable hypothesis. Thus the very evidence adduced by critics to support the view that Ulrich borrowed from Wolfram can even more effectively be employed to prove that Wolfram was the borrower and that the Lanzelet therefore must have been composed prior to Parzival.

3. The Lanzelet and Hartmann's Epics

This conclusion has some important ramifications for the debate about the nature of the link between the Lanzelet and Hartmann's epics as well, for if Richter would have been proved to be correct in his assumption that Parzival antedated the Lanzelet, then Wolfram's references in Parzival to Iwein and Erec coupled with Zwierzina's discovery (resulting from his comparative study of stylistic features and rhyme patterns in Hartmann's works) that Hartmann's epics were produced in the following order: Erec, Gregorius, Der arme Heinrich, Iwein,[102] would have ruled out the possibility that the Lanzelet was composed prior to any of Hartmann's epics since the latter were obviously completed before Parzival was written. Therefore, because it has been demonstrated that the Lanzelet preceded Wolfram's works, one of Richter's most convincing arguments for dating Hartmann's epics before the Lanzelet has been completely discredited and the viability of Richter's stance vis-à-vis the relationship between Ulrich's epic and Hartmann's works has been cast into doubt.[103]

However, since Hartmann's Iwein parallels the Lanzelet but seldom[104] and since Der arme Heinrich seems to have no ties whatsoever to Ulrich's epic, nothing definite can be said about the date of their origin relative to that of the Lanzelet. Likewise Gregorius, although it contains a number of verses that have analogues in the Lanzelet and even betrays a stylistic kinship with Ulrich's epic,[105] shares no distinctive feature with the latter which could be employed to determine which of the two works contributed to the other, for Schneider's claim that Ulrich must have borrowed from Gregorius because Hartmann's verse, "mit tôtvinsterre naht" (Greg. v. 2500)[106] suits its context well whereas its counterpart in

the Lanzelet "diu tôtvinster naht"(v. 6538) seems inappropriate in its context[107] can be ignored, since it is open to debate whether or not the line in the Lanzelet, which refers to a fainting spell, is inappropriate to its context and since the mere fact that one author uses an expression such as this more skillfully than another does not necessarily indicate that the latter borrowed from the former. Thus it is impossible by simply comparing the parallels between these two epics to ascertain which of them influenced the other. The only certainty is that there definitely was a link between them.

Hartmann's Erec, on the other hand, shares extensive parallel passages, numerous Arthurian names, and several motifs with Ulrich's Lanzelet and consequently should offer some clues as to which of the two authors contributed material to the other's work. One of the most problematical and potentially one of the most useful parallels between the two epics involves the poets' references to the source of sable. In the Lanzelet Ulrich remarks:

> von Cûmis, dâ Sibille
> diu alte wîssage was,
> was der zobel, als ich ez las. (Lanz. v. 8866-8869)

Hartmann, on the other hand, comments in Erec:

> der zobel was daz nie dehein man
> deheinen bezzern gewan
> noch tiurern envant
> über allez Connelant. (Erec v. 2000-2004)

He then goes on to describe Iconium's geographical position. Since both authors mistakenly allude to the similar-sounding place names, "Conne" (Iconium) and, according to both manuscripts of the Lanzelet, "kunis," (emended by Lachmann to "Cûmis")[108] as the source of sable it is clear that the two passages must somehow be related, for sable is derived from neither of these cities. According to Richter, moreover, these passages

must also be linked to two verses in Veldeke's Eneide in which the author erroneously represents the Sibyl's place of residence as Iconium:[109]

var toe Sibillen
toe Icônjen in her hûs. (Eneide v. 2600f.)[110]

Richter therefore speculates that Ulrich borrowed Hartmann's comment about sable derived from Iconium and then, when it reminded him of Veldeke's allusion to Iconium as the Sibyl's place of residence, chose to mention the Sibyl in the same context.[111] However, Richter's theory fails to explain why Ulrich, who is supposedly referring to Iconium, does not simply reproduce Hartmann's or Veldeke's spelling of the city name, which would have been a household word at the time, but instead associates sable with the enigmatic "kunis." This evident incongruity leads Teresa de Glinka-Janczewski to suggest that Ulrich, when reminded by Hartmann's comments about Iconium of Veldeke's incorrect allusion to it as the residence of the Sibyl, decided to flaunt his knowledge while correcting Veldeke by identifying "kunis," a medieval German inflected form of the Latin name, "Cumae," as the Sibyl's home.[113] Yet Glinka-Janczewski thereby overlooks the important fact that Ulrich, by correcting Veldeke's mistake of attributing the Sibyl to Iconium, would, if he truly was imitating Hartmann, himself be committing the grave and improbable error of contradicting Hartmann's original statement about sable being derived from Iconium (not Cumae). Thus neither of these theories which are predicated on the assumption that Hartmann's Erec antedated the Lanzelet is capable of satisfactorily explaining the link between the related passages in these epics.

On the other hand, this parallel between the Lanzelet and Hartmann's Erec can easily be accounted for if one assumes that Hartmann borrowed his comment about sable from Ulrich but, failing to properly decipher "kunis"

as a corrupt form of the Latin "Cumae," was led by Ulrich's allusion to the Sibyl and by Veldeke's claim that the Sibyl resided in Iconium to falsely deduce that Ulrich's "kunis" must be a corrupt form of the name, "Iconium." To such an explanation Rosenfeld can only object that Hartmann was too well versed in the classics to make such a mistake,[114] an objection which rests on pure conjecture since little is known about the extent of Hartmann's classical education. More important, however, is Neumann's observation that Cumae is not specifically associated with the Sibyl in Virgil's Aeneid[115] so that it is not at all unlikely that Hartmann, when confronted with Ulrich's reference to the Sibyl, was immediately reminded of the familiar reference to the Sibyl in Veldeke's Eneide and therefore associated Ulrich's "kunis" with the famous city of Iconium rather than with the obscure city of Cumae.

Yet if one accepts the hypothesis that Hartmann borrowed his comment about sable from Ulrich, then one must re-examine the numerous theories which have been devised to account for Hartmann's error in claiming that sable was a product of Iconium and ascertain whether or not they shed any light on Ulrich's equally inaccurate attribution of sable to Cumae.

Of course some of these theories, such as Neumann's unlikely conjecture that the ambassadors from Iconium who attended the imperial court in 1179 and 1188 may have worn clothes trimmed in sable, that Hartmann saw their apparel or had it described to him, and that he therefore spontaneously included an allusion to Iconium in his Erec because the name evoked an exotic, Oriental flavor[116] (which ignores the fact that the use of exotic place names in his epics is atypical of Hartmann but is characteristic of Ulrich),[117] do nothing to clarify the origins of the allusion to sable in the Lanzelet and can therefore be

dispensed with as irrelevant to the problem. Likewise, the suggestions of Carl von Kraus, who refers to the possible use of sable sleeping furs in a locale such as Iconium where the nights can be quite cold[118] and of Wackernagel, who speculates that Hartmann's "Connelant" may have resulted from a copyist's misreading of the word "Quenolant" (Finland) which was a possible source of sable,[119] cannot be utilised to explain Ulrich's reference to sable from Cumae.

Meanwhile Kroes' proposal that Hartmann's "Connelant" is quite simply a derivative of "kuna," the Slavic word for "marten,"[120] is totally implausible, for Hartmann himself could not have coined this hybrid name, since he clearly understands "Connelant" to be Iconium, a city which cannot be considered the land of the marten. One must therefore assume that Hartmann borrowed the term elsewhere, if Kroes is to be believed, but this is extremely improbable since the name "Connelant" and the word "kuna" are never recorded as such elsewhere in MHG literary or historical documents. Moreover, Hartmann is clearly referring not to the fur of the marten, an animal which at that time inhabited not only Russia and Poland but Germany and much of central Europe as well, but to the fur of the rare sable, a subspecies of the marten which inhabited only the northern regions of Russia and Siberia.[121] Since Slavic speakers clearly differentiated between the sable and marten in their vocabulary it would therefore make no sense for Hartmann or anyone else to designate the source of sable as the land of the marten, for the latter beast was ubiquitous. Thus Kroes' theory is untenable and must be rejected.

Conversely, there is much to be said for Fourquet's hypothesis that the reference to sable in Hartmann's Erec could have resulted from the author's misunderstanding of the Old French word "conins" (rabbit-skin),

which was included in a list of expensive fabrics in Hartmann's source which resembled the list in Chrétien's Erec:

> Robes de ver et d'erminetes,
> De conins et de violetes,
> D'escarlates, de dras de soie. (Chrétien, Erec v. 2113-2115)[122]

Fourquet's theory is particularly attractive because the error imputed to Hartmann by Fourquet is typical of the mistakes committed by MHG poets translating French sources and because Hartmann himself commits several such errors, as, for example, when he mistakes the preposition "entre" in Chrétien's reference to a geographical location: Antre Evroïc et Tenebroc. (Chrétien, Erec v. 2131) for part of a personal name:[123]

> der namen hoeret zellen:
> Entreferich und Tenebroc. (Hartmann, Erec v. 2233f.)

Kroes, however, rightly points out that Hartmann's "Conne" cannot be a permutation of the word "conins" because Hartmann's verses about sable from Iconium, which can in no way be construed as a translation or adaptation of the passages in Chrétien's Erec where "conins" is mentioned, appear in a section of Hartmann's epic where the author is markedly deviating from his source, Chrétien.[124]

On the other hand, Fourquet's theory could provide an ideal explanation for Ulrich's allusion in the Lanzelet to sable from "kunis," since it is quite conceivable that the corresponding section of Ulrich's French source contained the requisite phrase describing robes lined or trimmed "de sable, de conins et d'erminetes" which could have misled Ulrich into mistaking "conins" for a place name. Moreover, since "conins" appears as "counins" or "cunins" in some French dialects[125] and since such forms would be highly susceptible to corruption because of the juxtaposed "u", "n", and "i", it is not unlikely that Ulrich was confronted with such a form in the Urlanzelet, misread it as "cumis" or "cunis" and then,

having been influenced by the reference to samite from Alexandria (Lanz. v. 8862f.) in the verses which presumably immediately preceded the allusion to sable in the Urlanzelet, confused it with the name of the city in which the Sibyl resided (which was known in antiquity as Cumae but appears in the Old French Eneas (v. 2199ff.) as "Cumes,"[126] a form of the name which Ulrich's "kunis" was probably intended to approximate). Fourquet's theory therefore convincingly accounts for Ulrich's erroneous attribution of sable to Cumae and does so without suggesting that the author derived the information for this comment from a non-literary source and then spontaneously interpolated it in his epic, as Hartmann is alleged to have done. Furthermore such a theory about the derivation of Ulrich's and Hartmann's comments about the source of sable would also explain why Hartmann's spelling of Iconium reflects the Turkish pronunciation of the city name, "Konja," for contrary to Neumann's claims that Hartmann learned the Turkish name for the city from the envoys from Iconium that visited the Holy Roman Empire in 1179 and 1188,[127] it is much more likely that the Turkish name for the city would only have become well-known after the crusaders sacked Iconium and made a brief stay there in 1190. Thus, far from proving that Ulrich copied Hartmann, these two authors' references to the source of sable infer rather that Hartmann borrowed material for Erec from the Lanzelet.

The accuracy of this conclusion is further substantiated by the evidence gleaned from an analysis of the many other parallel passages in the Lanzelet and Hartmann's Erec, for studies have shown that with astonishing consistency the verses in Hartmann's epic which have close analogues in the Lanzelet have no clear antecedents in Chrétien's Erec and must therefore be regarded as innovations and/or interpolations on

Hartmann's part. Indeed, Gruhn's contention that no verses in the Lanzelet (except perhaps for some termini technici such as jousting terms which occur in basically the same form in practically all MHG Arthurian epics) correspond closely to any passage in Hartmann's Erec which is a direct translation of the text in Chrétien's epic[128] is even corroborated by Richter, who is reluctantly forced to concede the validity of Gruhn's claim in spite of the fact that he himself believes that Hartmann's Erec was composed prior to the Lanzelet.[129] Consequently, since Ulrich would have been unlikely to know which verses in Hartmann's work were derived directly from Chrétien's Erec and which were not and since he would have had no apparent reason for borrowing only the latter, it is only logical to assume that Hartmann was the borrower who, while composing his first sizable epic, imitated his predecessor Ulrich.[130]

Furthermore, in those cases where Ulrich's Lanzelet parallels not only Hartmann's Erec but an older MHG epic such as Veldeke's Eneide as well, it is apparent that whereas Ulrich derived the pertinent passages directly from Veldeke's work, Hartmann probably borrowed verses from the Eneide indirectly through the medium of the Lanzelet,[131] for Ulrich's epic generally reproduces verses taken from the Eneide more faithfully than does Hartmann's Erec, even in those cases where the Lanzelet and Erec coincide in their deviations from and modifications of Veldeke's original text. For example, Hartmann's words betray a definite kinship with lines in Ulrich's epic:

> des bluotes was er gar ersigen,
> die slege heten in erwigen
> daz im diu varwe gar erbleich
> und im diu kraft sô nâch entweich. (Erec v. 5720-23)
>
> Als er von den lewen streich,
> dô was er varlôs unde bleich
> und ersigen von dem bluote. (Lanz. v. 1979-81)

These themselves parallel verses in Veldeke's work more closely than do those in Hartmann's Erec:

in torne sî dannen streich.
dâ bleif sî varelôs ende bleich. (Eneide v. 10,721 f.)

This also holds true for the following parallels:

1. wan daz si diu sper ûf stâchen
daz si gar zebrâchen. (Erec v. 786f.)

beide si wol stâchen,
daz die schefte brâchen
und die schever hôhe vlugen.
für wâr wir daz sagen mugen,
daz si diu swert zuhten. (Lanz. v. 4475-79)

beide sî wale stâken,
dat die skechte brâken
end die skeveren hôge flogen.
in beidenthalf sî die swert togen. (Eneide v. 7363-66)

2. si liezen zesamene strîchen
alsô krefteclîchen
sô si meiste von ir sinnen
ûz den rossen mohten gewinnen. (Erec v. 812-15)

niemanne wolt entwîchen.
dô liezens dar strîchen,
sô si beide mit ir ahten
aller meist gewinnen mahten
ûz ir rossen, diu si riten. (Lanz. v. 2021-25)

er enwolde em niet ontwîken.
sî lieten dare strîken. (Eneide v. 7529f.)

Thus the correspondences between these three epics serve to furnish additional evidence that Hartmann borrowed from Ulrich rather than vice versa.[132]

Likewise, the parallels between the Lanzelet, Hartmann's Erec, and Eilhart's Tristrant seem to indicate that Hartmann borrowed verses from Ulrich's work which themselves had originally been derived by Ulrich from an earlier MHG epic, in this case Eilhart's Tristrant, as is demonstrated by a comparison of the following passages:[133]

gegurt umbe ir sîten
ein rieme von Îberne:
den tragent die vrouwen gerne. (Erec v. 1557-59)

sît irz hoerent gerne.
mit eime riemen von Iberne
was si begürtet harte wol. (Lanz. v. 5797-99)

gewaldig ze schotten und yberne.
Nun mögt ir hören gerne. (MS. H. of Tristrant v. 59f.)[134]

In addition, Hartmann - except for a brief mention of Tristan's name in his enumeration of Arthurian knights in Erec; "Tristram und Gâwel" (Erec v. 1650) which he takes from Chrétien - omits all reference to Tristan and Isolde in his epic, although Chrétien alludes to them frequently in his Erec:[135]

Por voir vos di qu' Iseuz la blonde
N'ot tant les crins sors ne luisanz
Que a cesti ne fust neanz. (Erec v. 424-6)

In truth I say that never did Iseut the Fair have such radiant golden tresses that she could be compared with this maiden.

La ou Tristanz le fier Morhot
An l'isle saint Sanson vainqui. (Erec v. 1248f.)

Even Tristan, when he slew fierce Morhot on Saint Sanson's isle.

Et Tristanz qui onques ne rist. (Erec v. 1713)

And Tristan who never laughed.

A cele premiere assanblee,
La ne fu pas Yseuz anblee,
Ne Brangiens an leu de li mise. (Erec v. 2075-77)

At this their first meeting, Iseut was not filched away, nor was Brangien put in her place.

O lui une dame si bele
Qu' Iseuz sanblast estre s'ancele. (Erec v. 4943f.)

With him was a lady ... so wondrous fair that Iseut would have seemed her waiting-maid.

Furthermore, only those verses in Hartmann's Erec which correspond to passages in the Lanzelet have analogues in Eilhart's Tristrant. All this

strongly suggests that Hartmann was unacquainted with Eilhart's work when he wrote his Erec and that his sole contact with the Tristrant came through the Lanzelet,[136] in which parallels to Eilhart's Tristrant abound.[137]

In summary, then, the evidence provided by close scrutiny of the parallel passages in the Lanzelet and Hartmann's Erec would definitely appear to support the contention that Hartmann emulated Ulrich and that Ulrich imitated Eilhart and Veldeke.

Nonetheless a number of critics maintain that Ulrich must have borrowed from Hartmann because the two authors frequently coincide in their use of various Arthurian names, many of which appear in the same or similar form in Chrétien's Erec as well,[138] as is shown by the following list of parallels:

Chrétien's Erec	Hartmann's Erec	Lanzelet
Loholz li fiz le roi Artu, Lohos or Lohous (1732)	Lohut fil roi Artus (1664)	Lout der milde (6891) (Arthur's son)
Rainduranz (2182)	Boidurant (2693)	Roidurant (7844)
Yvains de Loenel (1707)	Iwan von Lonel (1643)	Iwan von Lonel (P) or de Nonel (W) (2936)
Dodiniaus li sauvages, Dodins or Dodinez (1700)	der wilde Dodines (1637)	Dodines der wilde (7098)
Mauduiz li sages or Maudus (1699)	Maldwiz li sages (1636)	der wise Malduz (6052)
Gornemanz de Gohort, de Grohoht or de Goars (1695)	Gornemanz von Groharz (1632)	Gurnemanz (2630)
Torz li fiz le roi Ares, Estors or Estor or li fiz au roi (1528, 1728)	Estorz fil Ares (1661)	Torfilaret von Walest (P) or Orphilet (W) (5890, 8071)

Galegantins li Galois, Galerantins, Galogantins or Galerantis (1738)	Galegaundris (1662)	Galagandreiz (W) or Galagadruweiz (P) (734)
Guivrez li petiz (3868)	Guivreiz le pitiz (4477) (dwarf king of Ireland)	Givreiz (6017) (a dwarf king)
Tiebauz li Esclavons (5778)	Libaut (8506)	Diepalt (P) or Tybalt (W) (2781)
Pandragon, Pendragon or Pandagron (1811)	Utpandragon (1787)	Urprandagon (W) or Upandagron (P) (6734)
Bans de Gomoret, Bauz de Gormorez or Ban or Gameret (1975)	Beals von Gomoret (1977)	Pant von Genewis (P) or Genevis (W) (44f.)
chastel de Limors (4717)	castle of Limors (6315)	castle of Limors (1556)
Loz li rois (1737)	Los (1667)	kunic Lot (2629)
Guingomars, Guigamor, Guilemers or Guingamars (Lord of Avalon) (1954)	Gimoers (1930) (Lord of Avalon)	Gilimar (P) or Gymar (W) (6597)
Morgue sa suer, Morge, Morguen or Morgains or li fee (4218)	Famurgan (5156)	Femurgan (7185)
Erec, fiz le roi Lac or Erec, le fil Lac (3880)	Erec fil de roi Lac (2 and passim)	Erec fil de roi Lac (2264)
Outre-Gales or Destregales (1874, 3881)	Destregales (1819)	Destregals (8076)
Enide (passim)	Enite (passim)	Enite (W) enmitten (P) (6098)
Lanceloz del Lac (1694)	Lanzelot von Arlac (1631)	Lanzelet du Lac (P) or de Lac (W) (5092)

Yet this argument is invalidated by the fact that several of the names in the Lanzelet which also appear in both Hartmann's and Chrétien's Erec

could not have been derived by Ulrich from the latter works since they can indirectly be traced back to Ulrich's source, the Urlanzelet. Teresa de Glinka-Janczewski, for example, has established that because the names of certain castles in the Lanzelet such as Moreiz, Limors, and Schatel le Mort incorporate the syllable "mor" suggestive of the French word for "death," they were probably already so called in the Urlanzelet where they would have served as puns on the name of the family for whom the Urlanzelet was presumably composed, the de Morvilles.[139] As a result it is unlikely that Ulrich borrowed the name Limors from Hartmann's Erec, as Hofer claimed.[140]

The characters Givreiz and Torfilaret who play a role in the mantle episode in the Lanzelet also cannot have been taken by Ulrich from either Hartmann's or Chrétien's Erec, where similar names are found, for these figures must have been integral to the Urlanzelet since they also appear in other versions of the mantle episode such as the Old French fabliau Le Mantel Mautaillé[141] from which the author of the Urlanzelet probably drew some of the material for the corresponding episode of his own work. Moreover, Ulrich's Givreiz cannot be linked with the character of the same name in Hartmann's epic, since Hartmann identifies the latter as the king of Ireland whereas Ulrich, who states that the Arthurian knight Dodines periodically ravages the lands of the king of Ireland, depicts Givreiz as an ordinary Arthurian knight, who peacefully resides at Arthur's court in the company of the aforementioned Dodines and therefore cannot be identified with the king of Ireland described by Hartmann.[142] Similarly, the presence of King Arthur's son, Lout, in the Lanzelet cannot be ascribed to borrowing from either Chrétien's or Hartmann's Erec by Ulrich, since he is merely a name in a list in the latter works but takes an active, if minor, role in the Lanzelet where he is more fully described.[143]

The figure of Dodines himself, meanwhile, is unlikely to have been borrowed from either Hartmann's or Chrétien's Erec because in these latter works he is a mere name, whereas in the Lanzelet he fulfils an important role reflected in the epithet "der wilde", which all three authors associate with his name,[144] and is further qualified with the additional epithet "mit den breiten handen".[145] Since such epithets, which appear frequently in the Lanzelet, were presumably derived from the Urlanzelet, one can safely assume that Dodines himself was also depicted in Ulrich's source.

In addition, many characters in the Lanzelet such as Morgaine la Fée, Gilimar (who is mentioned in Wace's Roman de Brut)[146] or Uther Pendragon, Arthur's father (also referred to by Wace and Geoffrey of Monmouth),[147] were already familiar to the public as stock literary figures even before Chrétien penned his epics. This is evidenced by the deviation from Chrétien by the MHG authors in their addition of the prefix to King Arthur's father's name (Utpandragon instead of merely Pandragon) in conformance with Wace and by the existence of two Old French lays which celebrate the adventures of Guingamor and Lanval. These adventures are alluded to by Chrétien in Erec where they are associated with a hero named Guingomars:[148]

> Et Guingomars ses frere i vint;
> De l'Isle d'Avalon fu sire.
> De cestui avons oï dire
> Qu'il fu amis Morgain la fee,
> Et ce fu veritez provee. (Chrétien, Erec v. 1954-58)
>
> ... and had with him his brother Guigomar, lord of the Isle of Avalon. Of the latter we have heard it said that he was a friend of Morgan the Fay, and such he was in very truth.

The latter character may subsequently have been confused by Hartmann and Ulrich with Guigemar, the hero of yet another lay composed by Marie de

France. Consequently, there is no need to assume that Ulrich copied the names of these characters from either Hartmann's or Chrétien's works.

Furthermore, some of the names recorded in the Lanzelet resemble their counterparts in Chrétien's work more closely than their analogues in Hartmann's epic and therefore are unlikely to have been derived from the latter. Ulrich's "Diepalt" or "Tybalt," for example, is closer to Chrétien's Tiebauz than to Hartmann's "Libaut," and Ulrich's "Pant" (who must have been integral to the Urlanzelet since his namesake, Ban of Benoic, also plays the role of Lancelot's father in the French Prose Lancelot) resembles Chrétien's "Bans" more closely than Hartmann's "Bêals" does, while both Chrétien and Ulrich coincide by specifying that Loz or Lot is a king, whereas Hartmann merely depicts his counterpart, Los, as an ordinary Arthurian knight. Thus the vast majority of parallels between names in the Lanzelet and Hartmann's Erec can best be explained by postulating that the Urlanzelet was somehow linked to Chrétien's Erec, whence the parallels between the Lanzelet and Hartmann's work.

Meanwhile, Zwierzina's contention that Ulrich, because he alludes to Enite in the mantle episode of the Lanzelet (Lanz. v. 6098) must have borrowed from Hartmann,[149] is completely untenable because it is based on the reading "Enite diu reine" of the defective Manuscript W (which is obviously corrupt here since any reference to Enite would implicitly contradict Ulrich's portrayal of Erec as a bachelor in the rest of the epic and since an allusion to Enite makes no sense in the context of the mantle episode where Gawain's lady is the only one mentioned during the actual Mantelprobe to escape with her reputation untarnished)[150] which contrasts with the reading "enmitten diu reine" in what Pérennec judges to be the more reliable manuscript of the Lanzelet, Manuscript P,[151] where

Enite is never named. Yet even if one insists on adopting the reading of Manuscript W, as Richter does,[152] this reference to Enite does not prove that Ulrich borrowed from Hartmann, for Ulrich could have encountered this reference to Enite in his source, the Urlanzelet,[153] or could himself have come into contact with some other version of the Erec legend such as Chrétien's work,[154] or perhaps the lost MHG Erec epic whose existence is implied by the most recently discovered Wolfenbüttel fragments,[155] an epic which was probably not composed by Hartmann[156] and may have antedated his Erec.

Behre's argument that Ulrich, because he occasionally qualifies Erec's name in the Lanzelet with the same epithet "fil de roi Lac" that Hartmann regularly utilises to describe his hero in Erec, must have copied Hartmann's work,[157] is slightly more viable but can also be discounted because Behre fails to take into consideration the possibility that Ulrich (or the author of the Urlanzelet) may have derived this epithet from Chrétien, who actually entitles his epic "Erec, le fil Lac"[158] and refers to Erec elsewhere in his epic as "fiz le roi Lac" (Erec v. 3880), or from some other writer such as the author of the Old French Prose Erec who in the prologue to his work alludes to his source (Chrétien's Erec?) as a "histoire de Erec le filz du roy Lach en rime".[159] Thus it is not at all unlikely that the phrase "fil de roi Lac" was frequently associated with Erec's name in Old French and/or MHG literature before Hartmann ever employed it in his Erec and that Ulrich (or the author of the Urlanzelet) derived this epithet from such literature rather than directly from Hartmann's (or Chrétien's) Erec.

Likewise the fact that both Hartmann and Ulrich identify Destregales as Erec's kingdom[160] cannot be considered proof of Hartmann's influence on

Ulrich since the latter could have taken this reference from a manuscript of Chrétien's Erec or from some other source such as the MHG Erec epic whose existence is attested by the Wolfenbüttel fragments.

No more convincing is Zwierzina's claim,[161] refuted by Richter,[162] that Ulrich's allusion in the mantle episode to an Arthurian knight named "der wîse Maldûz" must have been inspired by the appearance of a "Maldwîz li sages" in Hartmann's Erec, for it is based on the improbable assumption that Ulrich would have thoughtlessly confused his readers by deliberately introducing a character into his epic whose name was almost identical to that of one of the more prominent villains portrayed in the Lanzelet, "der wîse Malduc," who, since his namesake Mauduyt plays a similar role in the French Prose Lancelot,[163] must already have been mentioned in the Urlanzelet. Moreover, Zwierzina fails to explain why Ulrich, who is not averse to retaining French words and names in his text, should deviate from Hartmann, who merely reproduces Chrétien's epithet "li sages" in its original French, by translating this epithet into MHG as "der wîse". Therefore it is probable that Ulrich's reference to "der wîse Maldûz" was not borrowed directly from Hartmann but was derived from Chrétien or from the Urlanzelet,[164] which itself was linked in some fashion to Chrétien's Erec.

Meanwhile, the fact that Hartmann refers in Erec to a "Lanzelot von Arlac" rather than to "Lanzelet de Lac" is no indication that Hartmann was unacquainted with Ulrich's epic since, as Brugger shows, Hartmann in this instance is manifestly doing nothing more than faithfully copying the name he found recorded in his source manuscript of Chrétien's Erec[165] and would have had no more grounds for emending the manuscript reading here from "Lanzelot" to "Lanzelet" and from "Arlac" to "de Lac" than he would have had for altering the name "Iwan" in Erec to "Iwein".

Conversely, Tilvis' discovery that the common Arthurian names found in the Lanzelet are more archaic in their form than their counterparts in Hartmann's and Wolfram's works may be taken as an indication that Ulrich's work antedated Hartmann's Erec, for where the latter author usually agrees with later writers in his spelling of Arthurian names such as "Iwein" and "Gawein" or "Gawan," Ulrich generally coincides with earlier authors such as Eilhart in his spelling of the same names as "Iwan" and "Walwan" or "Walwein".[166] Likewise Ulrich frequently utilises more archaic forms of the name "Arthur" in the genitive "Artures," and dative, "Artiure," forms which Hartmann and subsequent authors almost always avoid in favor of "Artuses" and "Artuse".[167] Thus the names in Ulrich's work seem to represent an earlier, more primitive stage in the evolution of Arthurian nomenclature than their counterparts in Hartmann's Erec.

However, one must be cautious not to attach too much importance to any argument for a particular date of composition of the Lanzelet relative to another work which is based primarily on evidence garnered from a comparison of the various forms of personal and place names which appear in both Ulrich's epic and in Chrétien's and/or Hartmann's Erec, for precisely such names comprise the words most often subject to distortion and corruption by medieval scribes and authors, as is illustrated by a cursory glance at the many forms a name such as "Guingomars" may take in the different manuscripts of Chrétien's Erec. Then, too, it is quite possible that a scribe would on occasion deliberately substitute a familiar name for a different but similar name recorded in his source[168] (as must have happened in the Lanzelet where the copyist of Manuscript W replaces the name "Torfilaret" in the mantle episode with the to him more familiar name "Orphilet") or would modify a name in his source which was

spelled in a fashion with which he was unaccustomed to make it conform to the local pronunciation or to the forms recorded in another epic with which he was acquainted. Consequently, no conclusive evidence regarding the date of composition of the Lanzelet can be derived from a comparative study of the parallel names appearing in Hartmann's Erec and Ulrich's epic, particularly since their respective sources are obviously linked with each other.

Fortunately, the analogous motifs utilised in the Lanzelet and Hartmann's Erec furnish a more reliable source of evidence relating to the date of composition of these works, since significant modification of such motifs through scribal error would be extremely unlikely to occur and since one need only compare Ulrich's version of a motif with those of Hartmann and Chrétien in order to determine whether or not Ulrich borrowed from Hartmann, for the implications are obvious if Ulrich should happen to follow Hartmann's version of a motif rather than Chrétien's where the former author is deviating from the latter.

However, when one actually compares those sections of the Lanzelet which some critics assert have been borrowed from Hartmann with their counterparts in both Hartmann's and Chrétien's Erec, one finds that Ulrich frequently imitates Chrétien in his presentation of a motif rather than Hartmann. For example, although at first glance it might seem as if the presence in all three works of passages describing the heroine's horse would indicate that Ulrich borrowed from Hartmann, since one would expect to find that Hartmann merely translated Chrétien's depiction of Enid's horse and that Ulrich then emulated Hartmann, closer inspection of these authors' varied presentations of this motif reveals, firstly, that Ulrich's description of Ade's palfrey has little in common with either of

Hartmann's versions of the motif; secondly, that Hartmann himself significantly modifies and expands on Chrétien's portrait of Enid's horse; thirdly, that on those occasions where Hartmann deviates from Chrétien's account the Lanzelet parallels Chrétien's Erec, not Hartmann's; and fourthly, that in the sole instance where Hartmann faithfully reproduces verses in Chrétien's Erec Ulrich fails to follow suit.[169] Thus Ulrich could conceivably have derived this motif from Chrétien's Erec or from the Urlanzelet, but could not have borrowed it from Hartmann.

Likewise where the stag hunt motif is concerned, Ulrich seems to imitate Chrétien's portrayal of the hunting of the white hart more closely than Hartmann's version of this motif, as even Richter is forced to admit,[170] for Ulrich in his account of this incident fails to adopt any of Hartmann's deviations from Chrétien's version of the story. As a result there is no reason to believe that this motif as it appears in the Lanzelet originated with Hartmann rather than with Chrétien or the author of the Urlanzelet.

Meanwhile the rude dwarf episode in Ulrich's epic, which was allegedly modelled after a similar episode in Hartmann's Erec, which itself reproduces Chrétien's depiction of the hero's encounter with a whip-wielding dwarf, differs in a number of significant details from both Chrétien's and Hartmann's versions of this adventure and in any case could not have been borrowed from either Hartmann's or Chrétien's Erec by Ulrich, since the presence of an analogous episode in the CdlC indicates that such a motif was already included in the Urlanzelet, whence the episode in the Lanzelet. Once again, therefore, the appearance of parallel motifs in the Lanzelet and Hartmann's Erec cannot be attributed to Ulrich's imitation of Hartmann's work but can only be accounted for by

assuming that Chrétien borrowed motifs from the Urlanzelet or that the author of the latter work borrowed motifs from Chrétien's Erec.

On the other hand, the Lanzelet shares some motifs with Hartmann's epic which are completely lacking in Chrétien's Erec. Wallner, for example, points out that Hartmann deviates markedly from Chrétien by including the three days' tournament motif, which figures so prominently in the Lanzelet, in his Erec. As a result, since Hartmann's account of the tourney coincides, not with that in Chrétien's Cligès where a four days' tournament is described, but with the portrayal of the three days' tournament in the Lanzelet, it is evident that Hartmann's version of this motif is akin to Ulrich's. Hartmann, moreover, agrees with Ulrich even in his depiction of details and choice of vocabulary as is demonstrated by both authors' use of the otherwise undocumented word "vespereide" (Lanz. v. 2855; Erec v. 2454), by their common reference to a personified "Melde" (Lanz. v. 3346; Erec v. 2516) and by their wording of the page's announcement of the impending tourney:

> von dem naehsten mântage
> dar nâch über drî wochen
> ist der turnei gesprochen. (Lanz. v. 2666-2668)
>
> der turnei wart gesprochen
> über drî wochen
> von dem naehsten mântage. (Hartmann, Erec v. 2236-2238)

The latter passage in particular contrasts sharply with Chrétien's statement that the tourney in his Erec will take place "Un mois aprés la pantecoste" (Chrétien, Erec v. 2135), (one month after Pentecost).[171] Therefore, one can only conclude that the accounts in Ulrich's epic and Hartmann's Erec are directly related and that Hartmann copied Ulrich or vice versa.

Yet if one subjects the two authors' versions of the three days' tournament episode to detailed scrutiny, it soon becomes apparent that only Hartmann could come into consideration as the borrower,[172] for several features of the episode, such as the motif of the hero's anonymity (which is central to the development of the plot in the Lanzelet and was demonstrably integral to the Urlanzelet since it recurs in the CdlC), appear out of place in Hartmann's epic. The hero's behavior when he lodges apart from Arthur's knights, makes use of three different coats of armor during the tournament and initially attempts to remain anonymous is largely unmotivated and has no apparent structural or symbolic function in Hartmann's epic, where the author sometimes contradicts Chrétien in order to make Erec's actions more plausible (Hartmann differs from Chrétien, who describes Erec as a renowned hero and proven knight, by stating that Erec is shy and secretive because he is an untried youth participating in his first tournament) whereas the same behavior attributed to Lancelot is perfectly comprehensible and well motivated in the context of Ulrich's poem where the hero consistently guards his anonymity by changing the color of his armor on each successive day of the tournament because he is ashamed of being nameless and lodges apart from Arthur's knights because he is not a member of Arthur's household.[173] Most important, however, is the fact that the three days' tournament motif itself appears in modified form in the French Prose Lancelot[174] and therefore must have already been included in the Urlanzelet. Thus the three days' tournament motif as it appears in Hartmann's Erec evinces all the signs of being an interpolation borrowed from the Lanzelet which has been imperfectly and inappropriately grafted onto the Erec legend.

In much the same way Hartmann's description of the golden net which furnished the fringe on the saddle-blanket of Enite's horse (Erec v. 7714-7729) has no analogue in Chrétien's work but to some extent parallels Ulrich's depiction of a fabulous net in the Lanzelet (v. 8508-8457)[175] (which Pérennec identifies as a mosquito net)[176] from which it was probably derived, for the net described by Hartmann hardly seems suitable for its alleged function as the trim on a saddle-blanket whereas the net portrayed by Ulrich would serve its apparent purpose as a mosquito net admirably.

Hartmann likewise deviates from Chrétien and emulates Ulrich in his description of the tent in the "Joie de la cour" episode (Erec v. 8902-8925), a description that in some details resembles the portrayal of the fantastic pavilion in the Lanzelet (v. 4758-4911) which also features a metal sculpture of an eagle crowning the tent and mentions embroidery on the walls of the tent which depicts various forms of animal life.[177] It is noteworthy that Ulrich could not have borrowed this motif from Hartmann since Wilmanns has demonstrated that the account in the Lanzelet, because it most closely parallels the depiction of Alexander's tent in the Old French Romans d'Alixandre of Lambert li Tors and Alexander de Bernay, must have been derived directly from the Urlanzelet, which presumably furnished the source of the parallel account in the Romans d'Alixandre.[178] Consequently, nothing stands in the way of the assumption that Hartmann here once more borrowed from the Lanzelet.

In summary, then, analysis of the parallel motifs appearing in both Hartmann's Erec and the Lanzelet seems to prove that Hartmann borrowed extensively from Ulrich's Lanzelet, a conclusion which is supported by the evidence of the parallel passages in the two works, while the recurrence

of similar or identical personal and/or place names in these epics fails to provide reliable information about the relationship between them. It therefore appears certain that Ulrich's Lanzelet antedated Hartmann's Erec.

E. Dating MHG Epics through a Comparative Study of Vocabulary, Rhyme, Meter, and Style

Nevertheless, numerous critics take issue with this conclusion and continue to maintain that Hartmann's Erec was composed prior to the Lanzelet. Richter, for one, takes this view and draws on an analysis of the vocabulary employed as rhyme words by Ulrich and Hartmann in their respective works for evidence that Hartmann's Erec antedated the Lanzelet.[179] However, this procedure is automatically suspect since not all the works concerned are Arthurian epics and since an author's choice of vocabulary could be dictated by a great number of factors such as the subject he is treating, his education, the audience for whom he is writing, the reading he has done lately, the influence of his native dialect, and his individual stylistic tendencies and literary preferences. Such variables make it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about the relative dates of composition of two works, which in this case were probably composed less than ten years apart, by simply tabulating the frequency with which the authors in question utilise a set number of arbitrarily selected courtly or uncourtly words in rhyming position, as Richter tries to do, for an author's word selection can vary greatly even within the bounds of a single epic.

Moreover, Richter's comparative study of the vocabulary utilised in the Lanzelet and in Hartmann's works establishes only that Hartmann employed much the same terminology in his Erec and Gregorius as did Ulrich in the Lanzelet, and that Hartmann in his later works came to resemble

Ulrich less and less in his choice of vocabulary,[180] a phenomenon which could easily be explained by admitting that Hartmann at the inception of his career imitated the most recently composed Arthurian epic, i.e., the Lanzelet, but gradually developed his own literary style independent of Ulrich's influence. Consequently, one could just as legitimately claim that Richter's evidence indicates that the Lanzelet was composed prior to Hartmann's Erec, for many critics have remarked on the numerous archaisms in Ulrich's speech,[181] archaisms which while not necessarily appearing in rhyming position could still be indicative of an early date of composition for the Lanzelet.

Not surprisingly, Richter further argues that because Ulrich discloses more skill as a versifier in the Lanzelet than Hartmann does in Erec, the latter work must have necessarily antedated the former since Ulrich was "der Fortgeschrittenere".[182] However, the degree of poetic talent manifested by two different authors hardly furnishes a valid criterion for estimating the relative dates of composition of their respective works, as is illustrated by the fact that the quality of an author's verse may vary greatly even within a single epic, as occurs in Hartmann's Iwein where the first thousand lines and the concluding verses seem to reflect a more primitive use of rhyme and meter than does the main body of the work.[183]

Then, too, in spite of his viewpoint, Richter is forced to admit that Ulrich remains "im älteren Stil befangen",[184] a view with which Neumaier, who cites the prevalence of "rührender Reim" in the Lanzelet as evidence of Ulrich's primitive poetic technique, fully agrees.[185] Carl von Kraus also remarks on Ulrich's "unmoderne Technik" and equates it with that displayed in the poetically weakest and most primitive sections of

Hartmann's Erec[186] while Peetz feels that Ulrich in his use of the monologue resembles Veldeke's Eneide and the Spielmannsepen more closely in style than he does Hartmann's Erec.[187] Thus while Ulrich may technically be a better poet in the Lanzelet than Hartmann was in Erec (which is not surprising since Erec was after all Hartmann's first epic), his archaic style nevertheless gives the lie to Richter's claims by implying that the Lanzelet is the older epic.[188]

F. Conclusion

Hence there is no reason to doubt that Ulrich's Lanzelet antedated all of Hartmann's epics, for Neumann's assertion that it took Hartmann several years to write each of his epics[189] rests on groundless speculation, as A. van der Lee aptly illustrates by pointing out that the Italian, Thomasin von Zerclaere, was able to compose the entire MHG Welsche Gast, a work comprising over 14,700 verses, within a time span of only ten months.[190] It is therefore eminently possible that Ulrich von Zatzikhoven completed his Lanzelet (which consists of less than 9,500 verses) in early 1195, within a year of its inception, and that Hartmann finished his Erec, which at the most may have comprised approximately 11,000 verses, by late 1196 or early 1197. Since Hartmann's religious epics Gregorius and Der arme Heinrich together make up less than 6,000 verses they could easily have been composed by the end of 1199, even if one reckons on a hiatus of one or two years during which Hartmann may have gone on a crusade or may have lacked a patron, and this would still have left Hartmann with two or three years within which he could have penned his Iwein, which is less than 10,000 verses long, before Wolfram made an allusion to the latter work in Parzival circa 1202-1204. When one

considers the fact that Hartmann's and Ulrich's epics were basically little more than free translations or slight adaptations of French sources and that these authors, unlike most modern writers, did not need to spontaneously invent the characters and plot of their works, such a schedule for the composition of their poems appears quite realistic.

In conclusion, therefore, practically all of the evidence available indicates that Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet antedated Hartmann's works and that Hartmann borrowed material from the former for his Erec. Not only does such an hypothesis explain why Ulrich patterned his epic exclusively after Veldeke's Eneide, Eilhart's Tristrant, and the Spielmannsepen[191] instead of imitating later authors such as Hartmann and Wolfram in style and technique, but it also explains why no other MHG epic comes into consideration as the model for Erec and, for that matter, for Parzival. Moreover, none of the theories which assume the priority of Hartmann's Erec can satisfactorily account for more than a few of the many parallels between the latter and Ulrich's work whereas the vast majority of these parallels are readily explicable if one accepts that the Lanzelet is the older epic. Consequently the Lanzelet can safely be designated as the oldest surviving Arthurian epic recorded in MHG literature.

Notes

1 René Pérennec, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Lanzelet. Traduction en francais moderne. Accompagnée d'une introduction et de notes," Diss. Université de Paris, 1970, II. 2.

2 Rudolf von Ems, Alexander, ed. Victor Junk, 2 Vols. (Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1929) - All subsequent quotations of the Alexander are derived from this edition.

3 Rudolf von Ems, Willehalm von Orlens, ed. Victor Junk, Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, 2 (1905; rpt. Dublin/Zürich: Weidmann, 1967).

4 Albert Gruhn, "Erek und Lanzelet," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 43 (1899), 269.

5 Carl Lachmann, "Briefe von Carl Lachmann (1824-1838)," Germania, NS 1 (1868), 490, 491.

6 Gruhn, pp. 267, 268.

7 Moriz Haupt, ed., Die Lieder und Büchlein und der arme Heinrich, by Hartmann von Aue (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1842), pp. xi, xii.

8 Wilhelm Wackernagel, Einleitung, Der Arme Heinrich Herrn Hartmanns von Aue und zwei jüngere Prosalegenden verwandten Inhaltes, ed. W. Toischer (Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1885), p. 21.

9 Gottfried von Strassburg, Tristan und Isold, ed. Friedrich Ranke, 6th ed. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1962).

10 Bligger von Steinach, "Er vunde guoten kouf," in Texte, Vol. I of Des Minnesangs Frühling, ed. Karl Lachmann, 36th ed. by Hugo Moser and Helmut Tervooren (Stuttgart: S. Hirzel, 1977) - All subsequent quotations from Des Minnesangs Frühling (MF) are derived from this edition.

11 Haupt, p. xii.

12 Gruhn, pp. 269, 270.

13 Heinrich von Freiberg, Die Ritterfahrt des Johann von Michelsberg in Heinrich von Freiberg (Dichtungen), ed. Alois Bernt (Halle, 1906; rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1978).

14 Teresa Mary de Glinka-Janczewski, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet: a critical study," M.A. Diss. University of London 1963, pp. 7, 8.

15 Konrad Zwierzina, "Mittelhochdeutsche Studien," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 45 (1901), 369-393.

16 Werner Schröder, "Zur Chronologie der drei grossen mittelhochdeutschen Epiker," Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift, 31 (1957), 274, 275.

17 Werner Richter, Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, Deutsche Forschungen, 27 (Frankfurt a.M.: Diesterweg, 1934), pp. 12-16.

18 Glinka-Janczewski, pp. 94-105.

19 Ibid., pp. 97-99.

20 Ibid., pp. 98, 99.

21 Ibid., pp. 99, 100.

22 Ibid., pp. 94-96.

23 W. Wilmanns, "Alexanderroman und Lanzelet," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 45 (1901), 245-248.

24 Glinka-Janczewski, p. 101.

25 Ibid., p. 103.

26 Wendelin Förster, ed., Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre), by Chrétien de Troyes, Vol. IV of Christian von Troyes sämtliche erhaltene Werke (Halle: 1899; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965), p. xlvi n.

27 Ludwig Denecke, Ritterdichter und Heidengötter (1150-1220) (Leipzig: H. Eichblatt, 1929), p. 117.

28 Gruhn, p. 302.

29 Ibid.

30 Wolfram von Eschenbach, Parzival, ed. Karl Lachmann, 6th ed. (Berlin/Leipzig, 1926; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965) - All subsequent quotations of Parzival are derived from this edition.

31 Friedrich Neumann, "Wann dichtete Hartmann von Aue?" in Studien zur deutschen Philologie des Mittelalters (Friedrich Panzer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Sept. 1950 dargebracht), ed. Richard Kienast (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1950), pp. 59-72; rpt. in Neumann's Kleinere Schriften zur deutschen Philologie des Mittelalters (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969), p. 47.

32 Peter Wapnewski, "Der Gregorius in Hartmanns Werk," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 80 (1961), 231.

33 Neumann, p. 47.

34 Hartmann von Aue, Erec, ed. Albert Leitzmann, 4th ed. by Ludwig Wolff, Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, 39 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967) - All subsequent quotations of Hartmann's Erec are derived from this edition.

35 Friedrich Neumann, "Connelant in Hartmanns 'Erec,'" Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 83 (1951/52), 277, 278, 286.

36 Ibid., pp. 277, 278.

37 Schröder, p. 274.

38 Neumann, "Connelant," p. 274.

39 Ibid., p. 279.

40 Ibid., pp. 277-279.

41 Gustav Rosenhagen, "Zobel von Connelant," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 55 (1917), 301, 302.

42 Friedrich Vogt, ed., Anmerkungen, Des Minnesangs Frühling, originally edited by Karl Lachmann, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1920), p. 446.

43 Hendricus Sparnaay, "Zu Hartmanns Kreuzzugslyrik," Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift, 26 (1952), 173.

44 Carl von Kraus, Des Minnesangs Frühling. Untersuchungen (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1939), pp. 437, 438.

45 Sparnaay, p. 175.

46 Friedrich Panzer, rev. of Étude sur Hartmann d'Aue, by F. Piquet, Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 31 (1899), 522.

47 Günther Jungbluth, "Das dritte Kreuzlied Hartmanns. Ein Baustein zu einem neuen Hartmannbild," Euphorion, 49 (1955), 153.

48 Kraus, p. 434.

49 Sparnaay, p. 175.

50 Panzer, p. 522.

51 Gerhard Eis, "Stammt daz Kreuzlied 'Ich var mit iuwern hulden' von Hartmann von Aue?" Euphorion, 46 (1952), 276.

52 W. Wilmanns, no title, Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 14 (n.d.), p. 146 as quoted in Hermann Paul, "Zum Leben Hartmanns von Aue," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 1 (1874), 537.

53 Wilhelm and Jakob Grimm, eds., Der Arme Heinrich, by Hartmann von Aue (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815), p. 135n.

54 Ibid.

55 F. Saran, Hartmann von Aue als Lyriker. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung (Halle: Niemeyer, 1889), p. 24.

56 Albert Leitzmann, "Die Ambraser Erecüberlieferung," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 59 (1935), 165, 166.

57 Hermann Paul, "Zum Leben Hartmanns von Aue," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 1 (1874), 536.

58 Peter Wapnewski, Hartmann von Aue, 4th ed., Sammlung Metzler, 17 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1969), p. 14.

59 Vogt, p. 446.

60 Sparnaay, p. 175.

61 Ibid.

62 Vogt, p. 447.

63 Kraus, pp. 440, 441.

64 Heinz Stolte, "Hartmanns sogenannte Witwenklage und sein drittes Kreuzlied," Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift, 25 (1951), 195-198.

65 Franz Saran, "Über Hartmann von Aue," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 23 (1898), 26.

66 Jungbluth, p. 156.

67 Ibid., pp. 152, 157, 158.

68 M. O'C. Walshe, "The Fabulous Geography of Lanzelet," London Mediaeval Studies, 1 (1937-39), 96, 97, 101.

69 Glinka-Janczewski, pp. 260, 261.

70 Samuel Singer, "Lanzelet," in Aufsätze und Vorträge (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912), p. 147.

71 Ruth Bauer, Studien zum Wigalois des Wirnt von Gravenberc, Germanische Studien, 180 (Berlin, 1936; rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1967), p. 82.

72 Albert Leitzmann, "Zu Ulrichs Lanzelet," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 55 (1931), 298.

73 Richter, p. 264.

74 Hans-Friedrich Rosenfeld, rev. of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, by Werner Richter, Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 169 (1936), 86.

75 Karl A. Hahn, ed., Lanzelet, by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven (Frankfurt a.M., 1845; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965), pp. xix, xx.

76 Jean Fourquet, "Le 'Giot' du Lanzelet et les deux 'Kyot' du Parzival," in Mélanges offerts à René Crozet ... à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire, ed. Pierre Gallais and Yves-Jean Riou (Poitiers: Société d'Études Médiévales, 1966), II, 976-980.

77 Roger Sherman Loomis, ed., Lanzelet, by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, trans. Kenneth G.T. Webster (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), pp. 189, 190, n. 105.

78 Ferdinand Lot, "Celtica," Romania, 24 (1895), 321, 322.

79 Emmanuel Philipot, "Un épisode d'Érec et Énide: 'La Joie de la Cour.'-Mabon l'enchanteur," Romania, 25 (1896), 276, 277.

80 E. Brugger, "Eigennamen in den Lais der Marie de France," Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 49 (1927), 452, 453.

81 Singer, pp. 144-146.

82 Madeleine Pelner Cosman, The Education of the Hero in Arthurian Romance (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1966), pp. 102-114.

83 Singer, pp. 144-161.

84 Ibid., p. 147.

85 Richter, p. 265.

86 Jessie L. Weston, The Legend of Sir Lancelot du Lac: Studies upon its Origin, Development, and Position in the Arthurian Romantic Cycle (London: David Nutt, 1901), p. 26.

87 Singer, p. 147.

88 Cosman, p. 106.

89 Ibid., pp. 107-109.

90 Ibid., pp. 110, 111.

91 Helga Schüppert, "Minneszenen und Struktur im 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven," Würzburger Prosastudien, 2 (1975), 130n.

92 Klaus M. Schmidt, "Frauenritter oder Artusritter? Über Struktur und Gehalt von Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven 'Lanzelet,'" Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 98 (1979), 10, 11.

93 Cosman, p. 114.

94 Ibid., p. 115.

95 Loomis, p. 158, n.5.

96 Weston, pp. 27, 28.

97 Ibid., p. 26-28.

98 Richter, pp. 264-266.

99 Ibid.

100 Ibid., p. 266.

101 Ibid., pp. 210, 211.

102 Zwierzina, pp. 369-393.

103 Karl Helm, rev. of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, by Werner Richter, Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, 57, Nos. 9-10 (1936), 301, 302.

104 Richter, pp. 260-263.

105 Ibid., p. 260, 261.

106 Hartmann von Aue, Gregorius, ed. Hermann Paul, 12th ed. by Ludwig Wolff (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1973).

107 Hermann Schneider, Heldendichtung, Geistlichendichtung, Ritterdichtung (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1925), p. 500.

108 An emendation of the manuscript reading of the Lanzelet proposed by Karl Lachmann to Karl Hahn: See Karl A. Hahn, ed., Lanzelet, by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven (Frankfurt a.M., 1845; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965), p. 278, note to 1.8866.

109 Richter, pp. 117-119.

110 Heinrich von Veldeke, Eneide, ed. Otto Behaghel (Heilbronn, 1882; rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1970) - All subsequent quotations of the Eneide are derived from this edition.

111 Ibid.

112 Rosenfeld, p. 86.

113 Glinka-Janczewski, pp. 238-240.

114 Rosenfeld, p. 86.

115 Neumann, "Connelant," p. 282.

116 Ibid., p. 286.

117 Richter, pp. 118, 119.

118 Kraus, p. 432.

119 Wilhelm Wackernagel, "Gewerbe, Handel und Schifffahrt der Germanen," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 9 (1853), 563.

120 H.W.J. Kroes, "Zobel aus Connelant (Conne)," Neophilologus, 23 (1938), 186, 187.

121 Neumann, "Connelant," pp. 279, 280.

122 Jean Fourquet, "'Zobel aus Connelant,'" Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 71 (1934), 268.

123 Pentti Tilvis, "Über die unmittelbaren Vorlagen von Hartmanns Erec und Iwein, Ulrichs Lanzelet und Wolframs Parzival," Neuphilologische Mitteilungen 60, (1959), I, 40, 41.

124 Kroes, p. 186.

125 Frédéric Godefroy, "connin," Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue francaise (1938).

126 Neumann, "Connelant," p. 282.

127 Ibid., p. 285.

128 Gruhn, p. 285.

129 Richter, p. 123.

130 Gruhn, p. 285.

131 Anton Wallner, rev. of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, by Werner Richter, Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 54 (1935), 174.

132 Ibid.

133 Ibid.

134 Eilhart von Oberge, [Tristrant], ed. Franz Lichtenstein, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, 19 (Strassburg, 1877; rpt. Hildeseim/New York: Georg Olms, 1973).

135 Hendricus Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue: Studien zu einer Biographie (Halle, 1933; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975), I, 9.

136 Wallner, p. 174.

137 Paul Schütze, "Das volkstümliche Element im Stil Ulrich von Zatzikhovens," Diss. Greifswald 1883, p. 37.

138 Alexander Neumaier, Die Beziehungen des Lanzelet zu den Werken Hartmanns v. Aue, Part II of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich v. Zatzikhoven, Programm des Staats-Gymnasiums in Troppau für das Schuljahr 1883-84 (Troppau: A. Trassler, 1884), p. 124.

[139] Glinka-Janczewski, pp. 75, 76.

[140] Stefan Hofer, "Der 'Lanzelet' des Ulrich von Zazikhoven und seine französische Quelle," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 75 (1959), 8.

[141] Richter, pp. 57, 99-101.

[142] Glinka-Janczewski, p. 170.

[143] G. Huet, "Deux personnages arturiens," Romania, 43 (1914), 100-102.

[144] Ibid., pp. 97-100.

[145] Richter, p. 84.

[146] Ibid., pp. 64, 65.

[147] Loomis, p. 216, n.203.

[148] Richter, pp. 64, 65.

[149] Zwierzina, pp. 367, 368.

[150] Gruhn, pp. 293-295.

[151] Pérennec, pp. 37, 57-59.

[152] Richter, pp. 96-99.

[153] Ibid., pp. 98, 99.

[154] Gruhn, p. 293.

[155] Kurt Gärtner, "Der Text der Wolfenbüttler Erec-Fragmente und seine Bedeutung für die Erec-Forschung," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur [Tübingen], 104 (1982), 365, 413-415.

[156] Eberhard Nellmann, "Ein zweiter Erec-Roman? Zu den neugefundenen Wolfenbütteler Fragmenten," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 101 (1982), 72.

[157] Adolf Behre, Die Kunst der Personenschilderung bei Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, Diss. Greifswald 1913 (Greifswald: J. Abel, 1913), p. 107.

[158] Konrad Zwierzina, Answer to a letter from M.H. Jellinek, in "Erec und Lanzelet," by M.H. Jellinek, in Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 47 (1904), 271.

[159] Anon., Die Prosaauflösung des Erec in Erec und Enide, ed. Wendelin Förster.

[160] Gruhn, p. 296.

[161] Konrad Zwierzina, "Studien," p. 368.

[162] Richter, pp. 89, 90.

163 Ibid., p. 74.

164 Ibid., p. 90.

165 E. Brugger, "'Der Schöne Feigling' in der arthurischen Literatur," Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 63 (1943), 296, n.1.

166 Tilvis, I, 49-65; II, 137-144.

167 Singer, pp. 148, 149.

168 Pérennec, pp. 36, 37.

169 Wallner, p. 173.

170 Richter, pp. 90-93.

171 Wallner, pp. 172, 173.

172 Ibid.

173 Richter, pp. 113-117.

174 Jessie L. Weston, The Three Days' Tournament: A Study in Romance and Folk-Lore (London, 1902; [rpt.] New York: Haskell House, 1965), pp. 9, 10.

175 Gruhn, pp. 283, 284.

176 Pérennec, p. 161, n.142.

177 Ernst Scheunemann, Artushof und Abenteuer: Zeichnung höfischen Daseins in Hartmanns Erec, Deutschkundliche Arbeiten, Allgemeine Reihe, 8 (Breslau: Maruschke und Berendt, 1937), pp. 93-96.

178 Wilmanns, "Alexanderroman," pp. 245-248.

179 Richter, pp. 147-215.

180 Pérennec, pp. 31, 32.

181 Gruhn, p. 289.

182 Richter, pp. 271-273.

183 Schröder, pp. 278-280.

184 Richter, p. 272.

185 Alexander Neumaier, Die metrischen Eigenthümlichkeiten des Gedichtes, Part I of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich v. Zatzikhoven, Programm des Staats-Gymnasiums in Troppau für das Schuljahr 1882-83, (Troppau: n.p., 1883), p. 41.

[186] Carl von Kraus, "Der rührende Reim im Mittelhochdeutschen," Zeitschrit für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 56 (1919), 29.

[187] Helmut Peetz, Der Monolog bei Hartmann von Aue mit einem Anhang: Der Monolog bei Ulrich von Zatzikhoven und Wirnt von Gravenberg (Greifswald: H. Adler, 1911), pp. 109, 118.

[188] Gruhn, p. 299.

[189] Neumann, "Wann dichtete Hartmann?" pp. 47-50.

[190] A. van der Lee, "Noch einmal die Datierung von Hartmanns Werken," Leuvense Bijdragen, 41 (1951), 110, 111.

[191] Wallner, p. 172.

IV. The Literary Value of the Lanzelet

The foregoing conclusions about the nature and date of origin of Ulrich's source and about the date of composition of the Lanzelet itself do much to vindicate other medieval authors' high opinions of Ulrich's epic as expressed, for example, by Rudolf von Ems in his Alexander:

> Von Zezinchoven her Uolrich
> sol ouch an witzen bezzern mich,
> der uns daz maere und die getât
> künstecliche getihtet hât,
> wie Lanzelet mit werdekeit
> manigen hôhen prîs erstreit. (Alexander, v. 3199 ff)

Not only must the Lanzelet be highly regarded as the sole surviving record of one of the first French Arthurian epics ever composed,[1] but it must also be esteemed in its own right as the oldest surviving MHG Arthurian epic and as a work which served as a literary model for later MHG authors such as Hartmann and Wolfram.

A. Structure and Themes in the Lanzelet

Yet the Lanzelet (or the Urlanzelet on which it is based) deserves to be valued not only because of its status as a pioneering work in Arthurian romance, but also because it is a cohesive, well-structured piece of literature. As the research of the last few decades has begun to show, although Ulrich's work may not strictly conform to the bipartite model of Chrétien's epics, it nevertheless evinces a definite structure which is in large part based on the repetition and variation of episodes and motifs (Motivreim) which are linked to each other by common themes and which illustrate the hero's development from a callow, ignorant youth to a perfect knight, ideal monarch, and consummate lover.

One of the first scholars to recognise the nature of the Lanzelet as an Entwicklungs- or Erziehungsroman was Luise Lerner, who noted that in the first half of Ulrich's work Lancelot is taught to become the perfect knight and then in the second half is groomed for his role as a benevolent monarch.[2] This interpretation of the Lanzelet was then confirmed as accurate by Soudek who found that the episodes in the first half of Ulrich's epic are arranged in such a way that they delineate the hero's gradual improvement as a knight, both in martial skills, as is reflected in the series of successively more difficult battles and progressively more formidable opponents that Lancelot successfully faces, and in chivalry, as is demonstrated by the gradually increasing courtliness of Lancelot's behavior and that of his foes. Soudek further observes that Ulrich's depiction of the hero's development into the best knight in the world in the first half of the Lanzelet is followed by the portrayal of Lancelot's "ethische Vervollkommnung", for, in contrast to prior episodes in which Lancelot's actions are motivated by the instinct of self-preservation or by self-interest, in the second half of the Lanzelet the hero learns to apply his knightly skills constructively by aiding the distressed and rescuing the helpless, whereby he develops and demonstrates the virtue of caritas.[3]

Gürttler, meanwhile, reveals another facet of the Lanzelet's structure when she remarks that the action in Ulrich's work centres around the hero's contacts with the Arthurian court and that the latter is utilised by Ulrich as a "formgebendes Prinzip". She points out that after each successive adventure experienced by Lancelot in the first half of the epic the hero receives and refuses an invitation to join Arthur's court and that these invitations are tendered to the hero by ever higher ranking

members of the Arthurian hierarchy culminating in King Arthur himself, while in the second half of the Lanzelet the hero's actions are always closely linked to the affairs of the Arthurian court of which he himself is now a member.[4] Thus the scene in the Lanzelet continually alternates between the Arthurian court and some other location.

An additional structural element in the Lanzelet identified by Soudek is the theme of the hero's quest for his identity. The anonymity of the hero is alluded to time and again in the first half of Ulrich's poem and it is this ignorance of his own name which interferes with Lancelot's acceptance by society (cf. the Linier episode) and leads him to refuse all invitations to attend Arthur's court, just as it is his subsequent discovery of his name which motivates him to visit Kardigan.[5]

Lancelot's quest for his identify does not, however, simply involve the search for his personal name, but instead also signifies the hero's quest for his place in society, here symbolised by the Arthurian court, a quest which is only concluded when Lancelot is reinstated in his heritage, the Kingdom of Genewis. Consequently the hero's progress in the search for his identity can be traced by noting Lancelot's changing social attitudes. In the first several episodes of the Lanzelet the hero plays the role of the outsider[6] who is alienated from and somewhat antagonistic toward established (Arthurian) society, as is shown by his consistent refusal to visit Arthur's court, by his initially hostile attitute towards Gawain, whom he goads into a fight, and by his opposition to the Arthurian knights during the three days' tournament. Then after Lancelot discovers his name and learns of his Arthurian heritage, he is slowly integrated into Arthurian society, becoming more and more community-oriented as he gradually ceases to act as a loner and begins to take the role of a leader

and act in concert with King Arthur and the knights of the Round Table,[8] firstly to release members of the court which are being held captive, secondly, to add non-Arthurian figures such as Malduc's daughter to Arthurian society, and thirdly, to restore the enchanted princess, Elidia (or Clidra) to human society, before he finally expands the Arthurian world by establishing offshoots of the Arthurian court at Genewis and Dodone with himself, a scion of the Arthurian line, functioning as the founder of a new dynasty. Lancelot's evolution as a knight is therefore also illustrated by his interaction with Arthurian society.

Yet another structural element which lends cohesion to the Lanzelet is the theme of love as it is manifested in the various Frauenbegegnungen which dominate Ulrich's epic, for Schüppert observes that the hero's encounters with women in the first half of the epic are deliberately patterned to portray Lancelot's progress in the realm of love in that each of Lancelot's three successive amies is more beautiful and displays more positive qualities than the preceding one.[9] To be sure, this pattern is interrupted by the Pluris episode, which represents a break in Lancelot's progress,[10] but, as Ruh remarks, the very fact that Lancelot is not completely happy at Pluris, but yearns to return to his former wife, Iblis, reveals the authenticity and viability of his love for her, just as the Mantelprobe episode authenticates Iblis' love for him.[11] Meanwhile, the succeeding Frauenbegegnungen in the Lanzelet serve to confirm the ideal love relationship between Lancelot and Iblis, since the hero forgoes the opportunity of entering into a liaison with Malduc's daughter (although he has in a fashion "won" her just as he won his first three amies, i.e. by killing their fathers or uncles) or with Elidia (Clidra) and remains true to his wife.

Furthermore, the Frauenbegegnungen in the Lanzelet are employed by Ulrich to illustrate various kinds of imperfect love which are contrasted with the ideal love relationship between Lancelot and Iblis and between Arthur and Guinevere (for the Valerin episodes furnish a mirror image of the Pluris episode since Guinevere's abduction by Valerin corresponds to Lancelot's imprisonment by the queen of Pluris,[12] only with the male and female roles reversed). It is for this reason that love is mentioned even in connection with subsidiary motifs in the Lanzelet such as the fabulous tent given Lancelot by the fairy and the vow of silence imposed on Gilimar, for this theme dominates the whole epic, as was recognized by the illuminator of the Manesse codex since, as Salowsky discovered,[13] the latter chose a verse from the prologue of the Lanzelet to grace the pages of a book apparently being discussed by a lady and knight which are portrayed on a page of the Manesse manuscript which introduces a selection of love lyrics. Thus the theme of love is one of the main threads binding the Lanzelet together.

Recent research has therefore dispelled the myth that the Lanzelet consists of nothing but a chaotic jumble of unconnected episodes and has instead disclosed that Ulrich's epic is a carefully constructed, multistranded romance whose individual episodes are closely linked by Motivreim and which as a result follows its own individual pattern and does not conform structurally to Chrétien's epics.

B. Conclusion

This analysis of the structure of the Lanzelet has therefore affirmed the work's literary value for, like Soudek,[14] most critics concur in acknowledging Ulrich's skill and fluency as a poet. Moreover, the fact

that the proliferation of battle and love scenes in the Lanzelet contributes to the structure of the epic by illustrating the dominant themes in Ulrich's work and the fact that the various episodes in the poem are closely linked to each other according to the principles of Motivreim and Steigerung reveals that the Lanzelet is not merely a shallow, titillating Unterhaltungsroman of a questionable ethical standard, but that it is rather a carefully crafted, although primitive, Entwicklungsroman which fulfils a didactic function. Consequently, when one considers that the Lanzelet and Urlanzelet were the first or among the first Arthurian epics ever written in their respective milieus, it becomes evident that the Lanzelet has consistently been underrated by critics and that its literary value has not been sufficiently appreciated.

Notes

1 Samuel Singer, Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Schweiz im Mittelalter, Sprache und Dichtung, Forschungen zur Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft, 17 (Bern: A. Francke, 1916), p. 19.

2 Luise Lerner, Studien zur Komposition des höfischen Romans im 13. Jahrhundert (Münster: Aschendorff, 1936), pp. 17, 18.

3 Ernst Soudek, "Suspense in the Early Arthurian Epic: An Introduction to Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Lancelet,'" in Studies in the Lancelot Legend, Rice University Studies, 58, No. 1 (Houston: William Marsh Rice University, 1972), pp. 1-23.

4 Karin R. Gürttler, "Künec Artûs der guote": Das Artusbild der höfischen Epik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts (Bonn: Bouvier, 1976), pp. 174, 175.

5 Ernst Soudek, "Die Funktion der Namensuche und der Zweikämpfe in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Lanzelet,'" Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik, 2 (1972), 173-181.

6 James A. Schultz, "'Lanzelet': A Flawless Hero in a Symmetrical World," Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur [Tübingen)], 102 (1980), 168.

7 René Pérennec, "Artusroman und Familie: 'Daz welsche buoch von Lanzelete,'" Acta Germanica: Jahrbuch des südafrikanischen Germanistenverbandes, 11 (1979), 20.

8 R.W. Fisher, "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet: In Search of 'Sens,'" Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 217 (1980), 281, 282.

9 Helga Schüppert, "Minneszenen und Struktur im 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven," Würzburger Prosastudien, 2 (1975), 127-136.

10 Fisher, p. 290.

11 Kurt Ruh, "Der 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhofen: Modell oder Kompilation?" in Deutsche Literatur des späten Mittelalters; Hamburger Colloquium 1973, ed. Wolfgang Harms and L. Peter Johnson (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1975), p. 52.

12 Barbara Thoran, "Zur Struktur des 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 103 (1984), 66.

13 Hellmut Salowsky, "Ein Hinweis auf das Lanzelet-Epos Ulrichs von Zazikhoven in der Manessischen Liederhandschrift. Zum Bilde Alrams von Gresten," Heidelberger Jahrbücher, 19 (1975), 41-48.

14 Ernst Soudek, Introd., Studies in the Lancelot Legend, p. vii.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Alexandre de Bernay and Lambert li Tors. Li Romans d'Alixandre. Ed. Heinrich Michelant. Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, 13. 2 Vols. Stuttgart, 1846; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1966.

Das altfranzösische Rolandslied. Ed. E. Stengel. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Theodor Weicher, 1900. Vol. I.

Chrétien de Troyes. Arthurian Romances. Trans. W.W. Comfort. 1914; rpt. London: J.M. Dent-Everyman's Library, 1975.

_____. Cligès. Vol. I of Christian von Troyes sämtliche Werke. Ed. Wendelin Förster. Halle, 1884; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965.

_____. Erec und Enide. Vol. III of Christian von Troyes sämtliche Werke. Ed. Wendelin Förster. Halle, 1890; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965.

_____. Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre). Vol. IV of Christian von Troyes sämtliche erhaltene Werke. Ed. Wendelin Förster. Halle, 1899; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965.

_____. Perceval: The Story of the Grail. Trans. Nigel Bryant. Arthurian Studies, 5. Cambridge, Eng.: D.S. Brewer; Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1982.

Des Minnesangs Frühling. Ed. Karl Lachmann. 36th ed. by Hugo Moser and Helmut Tervooren. Stuttgart: S. Hirzel, 1977. Vol. I.

Eilhart von Oberge. [Tristrant]. Ed. Franz Lichtenstein. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, 19. Strassburg, 1877; rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1973.

Eneas. Ed. Jacques Salverda de Grave. Bibliotheca Normannica: Denkmäler Normannischer Literatur und Sprache, 4. Halle: Niemeyer, 1891.

Gottfried von Strassburg. Tristan und Isold. Ed. Friedrich Ranke. 6th ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1962.

Hartmann von Aue. Erec. Ed. Albert Leitzmann. 4th ed. by Ludwig Wolf. Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, 39. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967.

_____. Gregorius. Ed. Hermann Paul. 12th ed. by Ludwig Wolff. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1973.

Heinrich von dem Türlin. Diu Crône. Ed. Gottlob Scholl. Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, 27. Stuttgart, 1852; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1966.

Heinrich von Freiberg. Die Ritterfahrt des Johann von Michelsberg. In: Heinrich von Freiberg (Dichtungen). Ed. Alois Bernt. Halle, 1906; rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1978.

Heinrich von Veldeke. Eneide. Ed. Otto Behaghel. Heilbronn, 1882; rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1970.

Hue de Rotelande. Ipomedon. Ed. A.J. Holden. Paris: Klincksieck, 1979.

Peredur, Son of Efrawg. In: The Mabinogion, Transs. Gwyn Jones and Thomas Jones. 2nd ed. London: J.M. Dent-Everyman's Library, 1974.

Die Prosaauflösung des Erec. In: Erec und Enide. Vol. III of Chrestien von Troyes sämtliche Werke. Ed. Wendelin Förster. Halle, 1890; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965.

Rudolf von Ems. Alexander. Ed. Victor Junk. 2 Vols. Leipzig: Karl Hiersemann, 1929.

_____. Willehalm von Orlens. Ed. Victor Junk. Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, 2. 1905; rpt. Dublin/Zürich: Weidmann, 1967.

Sir Lancelot of the Lake: A French Prose Romance of the Thirteenth Century. Trans. Lucy Allen Paton. London: George Routledge, 1929.

Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Lanzelet. Ed. Karl A. Hahn. Frankfurt a.M., 1845; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965.

Wirnt von Gravenberc. Wigalois, der Ritter mit dem Rade. Ed. J.M.N. Kapteyn. Bonn: Fritz Klopp, 1926. Vol. I.

Wolfram von Eschenbach. Parzival. Ed. Karl Lachmann. 6th ed. Berlin/Leipzig, 1926; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965.

Secondary Sources

Adelung, Johann Christoph. "Chronologisches Verzeichnis der Dichter und Gedichte aus dem Schwäbischen Zeitpuncte." Magazin für die deutsche Sprache, 2, Stuck 3 (1784), 1-92.

App, August, J. Lancelot in English Literature: His Role and Character. New York: Haskell House, 1965.

Büchtold, Jakob. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in der Schweiz. 1892; rpt. Frauenfeld: Huber, 1919.

_____. Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Diss. Frauenfeld 1870. Frauenfeld: J. Huber, 1870.

_____. "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven." Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, NS 19 (1874), 424-426.

Bartsch, Karl. "Die Eigennamen in Wolframs Parzival und Titurel." Germanistische Studien. Supplement zur Germania, 2 (1875), 114-159.

Bauer, Ruth. Studien zum Wigalois des Wirnt von Gravenberc. Germanische Studien, 180. Berlin, 1936; rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1967.

Bauss, Hermann. Studien zum Liebesdialog in der höfischen Epik. Diss. Marburg 1934. Marburg: Konrad Triltsch, 1937.

Behaghel, Otto, ed. Eneide. By Heinrich von Veldeke. Heilbronn, 1882; rpt. New York/Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1970.

_____. "Heinrich von Veldeke und Ulrich von Zazikhofen." Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, NS 25 (1880), 344-347.

Behre, Adolf. Die Kunst der Personenschilderung bei Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Diss. Greifswald 1913. Greifswald: J. Abel, 1913.

Bezzola, Reto R. Le sens de l'aventure et de l'amour; (Chrétien de Troyes). Paris: La Jeune Parque, 1947.

Bode, Friedrich. Die Kampfesschilderungen in den mittelhochdeutschen Epen. Greifswald: H. Adler, 1909.

Bodensohn, Heinz. Die Festschilderungen in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung. Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, 9. Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff, 1936.

Boor, Helmut de. Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang. 1170-1250. Vol. II of Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Eds. Helmut de Boor and Richard Newald. 10th ed. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1979.

Briel, Henri de, and Manuel Herrmann. King Arthur's Knights and the Myths of the Round Table; A new Approach to the French Lancelot in Prose. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1972.

Brinkmann, Hennig. Zu Wesen und Form mittelalterlicher Dichtung. Halle: Niemeyer, 1928.

Brogsitter, Karl Otto. Artusepik. Sammlung Metzler, 38. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1965.

Brown, Arthur C.L. "Arthur's Loss of Queen and Kingdom." Speculum, 15 (1940), 3-11.

_____. "The Grail and the English Sir Perceval." Modern Philology, 16 (1919), 553-568; 17 (1920), 361-382; 18 (1920/21), 201-228, 661-673; 22 (1924/25), 79-96, 113-132.

Bruce, James Douglas. "Arthuriana." The Romanic Review, 3 (1912), 173-193.

_____. The Evolution of the Arthurian Romance From the Beginnings Down to the Year 1300. 2nd ed. 1928; rpt. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958. Vol. I.

E. Brugger, "Bliocadran, the Father of Perceval." In: Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis. Paris: Champion, 1927, pp. 147-174.

_____. "Eigennamen in den Lais der Marie de France." Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 49 (1927), 201-252, 381-484.

_____. Rev. of Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance, by Roger S. Loomis. Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 54 (1931), 81-125.

_____. "'Der Schöne Feigling' in der arthurischen Literatur." Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 61 (1941), 1-44; 63 (1943), 123-173, 275-328; 65 (1949), 121-192, 289-433.

Campion, John L. Rev. of Der Monolog bei Hartmann von Aue. Mit einem Anhang: der Monolog bei Ulrich von Zatzikhoven und Wirnt von Gravenberg, by Helmut Peetz; Rev. of 'Lanzelet,' in Aufsätze und Vorträge, by Samuel Singer; Rev. of Die Kunst der Personenschilderung bei Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, by Adolf Behre; Rev. of Vorstudien zu einer Neuausgabe des Lanzelet von Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, by Oskar Hannink. Modern Language Notes, 32 (1917), 416-421.

Carter, Charles Henry. "Ipomedon, an Illustration of Romance Origin." In: Haverford Essays: Studies in Modern Literature Prepared by Some Former Pupils of Professor Francis B. Gummere in Honor of the Completion of the Twentieth Year of his Teaching in Haverford College. 1909; rpt. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, pp. 235-270.

Combridge, Rosemary N. Das Fragment B des Lanzelet Ulrichs von Zazikhoven." Euphorion, 57 (1963), 200-209.

_____. "Lanzelet and the Queens." In: Essays in German and Dutch Literature. Ed. W.D. Robson-Scott. Publications of the Institute of Germanic Studies, 15. London: University of London, 1973, pp. 42-64.

_____. "The Problems of a New Edition of Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Lanzelet.'" In: Probleme mittelalterlicher Überlieferung und Textkritik; Oxforder Colloquium 1966. Eds. Peter F. Ganz and Werner Schröder. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1968, pp. 67-80.

Cosman, Madeleine Pelner. The Education of the Hero in Arthurian Romance. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966.

Cross, Tom Peete, and William Albert Nitze. Lancelot and Guinevere: A Study on the Origins of Courtly Love. Chicago, 1930; rpt. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1964.

Denecke, Ludwig. Ritterdichter und Heidengötter (1150-1220). Leipzig: H. Eichblatt, 1929.

Diez, Friedrich. Die Poesie der Troubadours. Zwickau: Gebrüder Schumann, 1826.

Docen, B.J. "Versuch einer vollständigen Literatur der älteren Deutschen Poesie, von den frühesten Zeiten bis zu Anfange des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Erste Abteilung, das alphabetische Verzeichniss sämmtlicher Dichter vom J. 800 bis 1500 enthaltend." Museum für Altdeutsche Literatur und Kunst, 1 (1809), Stuck 1, pp. 126-234.

Eggers, Hans. Das Mittelhochdeutsche. Vol. II of Deutsche Sprachgeschichte. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1965.

Ehrismann, Gustav. Die mittelhochdeutsche Literatur. Part II of Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Schlussband. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1935.

_____. "Märchen im höfischen Epos." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 30 (1905), 14-54.

Eis, Gerhard. "Stammt das Kreuzlied 'Ich var mit iuwern hulden' von Hartmann von Aue?" Euphorion, 46 (1952), 276-279.

_____. "Ulrich von Zazikhoven." In: Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon. Ed. Karl Langosch. Vol. IV. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1953, cols. 621-625.

Elardo, Ronald J. "'Lanzelet,' Alchemy, and Individuation," Symposium, 34 (1980/81), 138-154.

Emmel, Hildegard. Formprobleme des Artusromans und der Graldichtung: Die Bedeutung des Artuskreises für das Gefüge des Romans im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert in Frankreich, Deutschland und den Niederlanden. Bern: A. Francke, 1951.

Fauriel, C. "Lancelot du Lac." In: Histoire littéraire de la France. Paris, 1852; rpt. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1971. Vol. XXII, pp. 212-223.

Fisher, R.W. "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet: In Search of 'Sens.'" Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 217 (1980), 277-292.

Förster, Wendelin, ed., Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre). By Chrétien de Troyes. Vol. IV of Christian von Troyes sämtliche erhaltene Werke. Halle, 1899; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1965.

_____. Kristian von Troyes; Wörterbuch zu seinen sämtlichen Werken. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1914.

Fourquet, Jean. "Le 'Giot' du Lanzelet et les deux 'Kyot' du Parzival." In: Mélanges offerts à Rene Crozet ... a l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire ... Eds. Pierre Gallais and Yves-Jean Riou. Poitiers: Société d'Études Médiévales, 1966. Vol. II, pp. 975-980.

_____. "Les noms propres du Parzival," In: Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hoepffner ... Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 113. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949, pp. 245-260.

_____. "Le rapport entre l'oeuvre et la source chez Chrétien de Troyes et le problème des sources bretonnes." Romance Philology, 9 (1955/56), 298-312.

_____. "'Zobel aus Connelant.'" Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 71 (1934), 268.

Frank, Emma. Der Schlangenkuss. Die Geschichte eines Erlösungsmotivs in deutscher Volksdichtung. Form und Geist, 9. Leipzig: Hermann Eichblatt, 1928.

Frappier, Jean, trans. Le Chevalier de la Charrette (Lancelot). By Chrétien de Troyes. 2nd ed. Paris: Champion, 1967.

_____. "Chrétien de Troyes." In: Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages; A Collaborative History. Ed. R.S. Loomis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, pp. 157-191.

_____. "L' 'Institution' de Lancelot dans le Lancelot en Prose." In: Mélanges de philologie romane et de littérature médiévale offerts à Ernest Hoepffner... Publication de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 113. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949, pp. 269-278.

_____. "The Vulgate Cycle." In: Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages; A Collaborative History. Ed. R.S. Loomis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, pp. 295-318.

Gärtner, Kurt. "Der Text der Wolfenbüttler Erec-Fragmente und seine Bedeutung für die Erec-Forschung." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur [Tübingen], 104 (1982), 207-230, 359-430.

Gervinus, G.G. Von den ersten Spuren der deutschen Dichtung bis gegen das Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts. Part I of Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Deutschen. Vol. I of Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. Vol. II of Historische Schriften. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1840.

Glinka-Janczewski, Teresa Mary de. "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet: a critical study." M.A. Diss. University of London 1963.

Godefroy, Frédéric. "connin." Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue francaise. 1938 ed.

Goedeke, Karl, ed. Deutsche Dichtung im Mittelalter. Hanover: L. Ehlermann, 1854.

Golther, Wolfgang. Die deutsche Dichtung im Mittelalter, 800 bis 1500. 2nd ed. Epochen der deutschen Literatur, 1. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1922.

_____. Rev. of Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) und das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre) Vol. IV of Christian von Troyes. Sämtliche erhaltene Werke nach allen bekannten Handschriften, ed. by Wendelin Förster. Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 22 (1900), 2nd Half, 1-5.

Grimm, Jakob and Wilhelm, eds. Der arme Heinrich. By Hartmann von Aue. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1815.

Gruhn, Albert. "Erek und Lanzelet." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 43 (1899), 265-302.

Gürttler, Karin R. "Künec Artûs der guote": Das Artusbild der höfischen Epik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Bonn: Bouvier, 1976.

Hahn, Karl A., ed. Lanzelet. By Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Frankfurt a.M., 1845; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965.

Hannink, Oskar. "Vorstudien zu einer Neuausgabe des Lanzelet von Ulrich von Zazikhoven." Diss. Gottingen 1914.

Harward, Vernon J. The Dwarfs of Arthurian Romance and Celtic Tradition. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958.

Haug, Walter. "Das Land, von welchem niemand wiederkehrt." Mythos, Fiktion und Wahrheit in Chrétien's "Chevalier de la Charrete," im "Lanzelet" Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven und im "Lancelot"-Prosaroman. Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte, 21. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1978.

Haupt, Moriz, ed. Die Lieder und Büchlein und der arme Heinrich. By Hartmann von Aue. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1842.

_____. Rev. of Lanzelet. Eine Erzählung von Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, ed. by K.A. Hahn. Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik, Nos. 14, 15 (July 1845), cols. 105-118.

Heinzel, Richard. "Ein französischer Roman des 13. Jahrhunderts." Österreichische Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft und Kunst, NS 2 (1872), 385-394, 427-439, 460-471. Rpt. in Kleine Schriften von Richard Heinzel. Eds. M.H. Jellinek and Carl von Kraus. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1907, pp. 63-116.

Helm, Karl. Rev. of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, by Werner Richter. Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, 57, (1936), cols. 300-302.

Herchenbach, Hugo. Das Präsens historicum im Mittelhochdeutschen. Palaestra, 104. Berlin, 1911; New York: Johnson Reprint, 1970.

Hibbard, Laura. "The Sword Bridge of Chrétien de Troyes and its Celtic Original." The Romanic Review, 4 (1913), 166-190.

Hofer, Stefan. Chrétien de Troyes: Leben und Werke des altfranzösischen Epikers. Graz: Bohlau, 1954.

_____. "Der 'Lanzelet' des Ulrich von Zazikhoven und seine französische Quelle." Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 75 (1959), 1-36.

Hofstäter, Felix Franz, trans. Lanzelot du Lac. By Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Part I of Altdeutsche Gedichte aus den Zeiten der Tafelrunde. Vienna: C. Schaumburg, 1811.

Holmes, Urban Tigner, Jr. A History of Old French Literature from the Origins to 1300. Revised ed. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.

Huby, Michel. "Remarques sur la structure du 'Lanzelet.'" In: Mélanges pour Jean Fourquet: 37 essais de linguistique germanique et de littérature du moyen âge francais et allemand. Eds. P. Valentin and G. Zink. Munich: Hueber; Paris: Klincksieck, 1969, pp. 147-156.

Huet, G. "Duex personnages arturiens." Romania, 43 (1914), 96-102.

Jackson, W.H. "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet and the Theme of Resistance to Royal Power." German Life and Letters, 28 (1974/75), 285-297.

Jänicke, Oskar. Rev. of Freie Forschung. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur und Sprache, by Franz Pfeiffer. Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen, NS 2 (1868), 296-305.

Jellinek, M.H. "Erec und Lanzelet." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 47 (1904), 267-270.

Jungbluth, Günther. "Das dritte Kreuzlied Hartmanns: Ein Baustein zu einem neuen Hartmannbild." Euphorion, 49 (1955), 145-162.

Kellermann, Wilhelm. "Altdeutsche und altfranzösische Literatur II: Epische Vergleichsprobleme und Vergleichsarbeiten." Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, 26 (1938), 293-317.

Khull, Ferdinand. Geschichte der altdeutschen Dichtung. Graz: Leuschner und Lubensky, 1886.

Knoll, Hiltrud. "Studien zur realen und ausserrealen Welt im deutschen Artusroman. (Erec, Iwein, Lanzelet, Wigalois)." Diss. Bonn 1966.

Koberstein, August. Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur bis zum Ende des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Vol. I of Grundriss der Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur. 5th ed. by Karl Bartsch. Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1872. Vol. I.

Köhler, Erich. Ideal und Wirklichkeit in der höfischen Epik: Studien zur Form der frühen Artus- und Graldichtung. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 97. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1956.

Kohlschmidt, Werner. "Schweizerische Literatur." In: Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte. Eds. Paul Merker and Wolfgang Stammler. 2nd ed. by Klaus Kanzog. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1977. Vol. III, pp. 708-785.

Kosch, Wilhelm. "Ulrich von Zatzikhofen." Deutsches Literaturlexikon. 2nd ed. Bern: A. Francke, 1958. Vol. IV, p. 3086.

Kraus, Carl von. Des Minnesangs Frühling: Untersuchungen. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1939.

_____. "Der rührende Reim im Mittelhochdeutschen." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 56 (1919), 1-76.

Kroes, H.W.J. "Zobel aus Connelant (Conne)." Neophilologus, 23 (1938), 185-187.

Kuhn, Hugo. "Die Klassik des Rittertums in der Stauferzeit: 1170-1230." In: Annalen der deutschen Literatur. Ed. Heinz Otto Burger. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971, pp. 99-177.

Lachmann, Carl. "Briefe von Carl Lachmann (1824-1838)." Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, NS 1 (1868), 489-496.

_____, joint ed. Iwein. By Hartmann von Aue. Ed. G.F. Benecke. 2nd ed. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1843.

Lee, A. van der. "Noch einmal die Datierung von Hartmanns Werken." Leuvense Bijdragen, 41 (1951), 110-116.

Leitzmann, Albert. "Die Ambraser Erecüberlieferung." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 59 (1935), 143-234.

_____. "Zu Ulrichs Lanzelet." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 55, (1931), 293-305.

Lejeune, Rita. "The Troubadours." In: Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages; A Collaborative History. Ed. R.S. Loomis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, pp. 393-399.

Lerner, Luise. Studien zur Komposition des höfischen Romans im 13. Jahrhundert. Münster: Aschendorff, 1936.

Lewis, Charles Bertram. Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance: A Study of the Sources of Chrestien de Troyes' "Yvain" and Other Arthurian Romances. St. Andrews University Publications, 32. Edinburgh: Humphrey Milford; Oxford University Press, 1932.

Lichtenberg, Heinrich. Die Architekturdarstellungen in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung. Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, 4. Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff, 1931.

Lichtenstein, Franz, ed. [Tristrant]. By Eilhart von Oberge. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, 19. Strassburg, 1877; rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1973.

Littmann, Esther Gorny. "Techniques of Creating Suspense in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Lanzelet.'" Diss. University of Michigan 1975.

Lofmark, Carl. "Der höfische Dichter als Übersetzer." In: Probleme mittelhochdeutscher Erzählformen; Marburger Colloquium 1969. Eds. Peter F. Ganz and Werner Schröder. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1972, pp. 40-62.

Loomis, Gertrude (Schoepperle). Tristan and Isolt; A Study of the Sources of the Romance. 2nd ed. New York: B. Franklin, 1960. Vol. II.

Loomis, Roger Sherman. Arthurian Legends in Medieval Art. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1938.

_____. Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes. New York: Columbia University Press, 1911.

_____. "Baudemaguz." Romania, 63 (1937), 383-393.

_____. "Bruce's Conception of the History of Lancelot." Rev. of The Evolution of Arthurian Romance, by James Douglas Bruce. Bibliographical Bulletin of the International Arthurian Society, 6 (1954), 101, 102.

_____. Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance. 1927; rpt. New York: Haskell House, 1967.

_____. "The Date, Source, and Subject of the Arthurian Sculpture at Modena." In: Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude (Schoepperle) Loomis. Paris: Champion, 1927, pp. 209-228.

_____. "The Descent of Lancelot from Lug." Bibliographical Bulletin of the International Arthurian Society, 3 (1951), 69-73.

_____. The Development of Arthurian Romance. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1963.

_____. "The Fier Baiser in Mandeville's Travels, Arthurian romance and Irish saga." Studi Medievali, NS 17 (1951), 104-113.

_____. "From Segontium to Sinadon." Speculum, 22 (1947), 520-533. Rpt. in his Wales and the Arthurian Legend. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1956, pp. 1-18.

_____. "Fundamental Facts about Arthurian Origins." In: Studi in Onore di Italo Siciliano. Biblioteca dell' "Archivum Romanicum." Ser. 1: Storia, Letteratura, Paleografia, 86. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1966, Vol. II, pp. 677-683.

_____, ed. Lanzelet. By Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Trans. Kenneth G.T. Webster. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

_____. "More Celtic Elements in Gawain and the Green Knight." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 42 (1943), 149-184. Rpt. "Welsh Elements in 'Gawain and the Green Knight.'" In his Wales and the Arthurian Legend. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1956, pp. 77-90.

_____. "Morgain la Fée and the Celtic Goddesses." Speculum, 20 (1945), 183-203. Rpt. in his Wales and the Arthurian Legend. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1956, pp. 105-130.

_____. "Morgain la Fée in Oral Tradition." Romania, 80 (1959), 337-367. Rpt. in his Studies in Medieval Literature: A Memorial Collection of Essays. New York: B. Franklin, 1970, pp. 3-33.

_____. "Objections to the Celtic Origin of the 'Matière de Bretagne.'" Romania, 79 (1958), 47-77. Rpt. in his Studies in Medieval Literature: A Memorial Collection of Essays. New York: B. Franklin, 1970, pp. 213-243.

_____. "The Oral Diffusion of the Arthurian Legend." In: Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages; A Collaborative History. Ed. R.S. Loomis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, pp. 52-63.

_____. Rev. of The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the Year 1300, by James Douglas Bruce. Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 23 (1924), 582-591.

_____. "Some Names in Arthurian Romance." Publications of the Modern Languages Association of America, 45 (1930), 416-443.

_____. "The Visit to the Perilous Castle: A Study of the Arthurian Modifications of an Irish Theme." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 48 (1933), 1000-1035. Rpt. in his Studies in Medieval Literature: A Memorial Collection of Essays. New York: B. Franklin, 1970, pp. 99-134.

Lot, Ferdinand, "Celtica." Romania, 24 (1895), 321-338.

_____. Étude sur le Lancelot en prose. Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études; Sciences historiques et philologiques, 226. 1918; rpt. Paris: Champion, 1954.

_____. "Nouvelles études sur la provenance du cycle arthurien: Glastonbury et Avalon." Romania, 27 (1898), 529-573.

Lütjens, August. Der Zwerg in der deutschen Heldendichtung des Mittelalters. Germanistische Abhandlungen, 38. Breslau: M. und H. Marcus, 1911.

Luttrell, Claude. The Creation of the First Arthurian Romance: A Quest. London: Edward Arnold, 1974.

Märtens, Paul. "Zur Lanzelotsage. Eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung." Romanische Studien, 5 (1880), 559-700.

Marx, Jean. Nouvelles recherches sur la littérature arthurienne. Bibliothèque francaise et romane, Série C: Études littéraires, 9. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1965.

Maynadier, Gustavus Howard. The Arthur of the English Poets. Boston and New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1907.

Menhardt, H. "Das neue Klagenfurter Lanzelet-Bruchstück G^{K}." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 66 (1929), 257-267.

Meyer-Lübke, W. "Crestien von Troyes Erec und Enide." Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 44 (1917), 129-188.

Micha, Alexandre. "Miscellaneous French Romances in Verse." In: Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages; A Collaborative History. Ed. R.S. Loomis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, pp. 358-392.

_____. "Sur les sources de la 'Charrette.'" Romania, 71 (1950), 345-358.

Müller, Karl Friedrich. Die literarische Kritik in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung und ihr Wesen. Deutsche Forschungen, 26. Frankfurt a.M., 1933; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967.

Nadler, Josef. Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Schweiz. Leipzig: Grethlein, 1932.

Naumann, Hans. Deutsches Dichten und Denken von der germanischen bis zur staufischen Zeit. (Deutsche Literaturgeschichte vom 5. bis 13. Jahrhundert). 2nd ed. Sammlung Göschen, 1121. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1952.

Nellmann, Eberhard. "Ein zweiter Erec-Roman? Zu den neugefundenen Wolfenbütteler Fragmenten." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 101 (1982), 28-78.

Neumaier, Alexander. Die metrischen Eigenthümlichkeiten des Gedichtes. Part I of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich v. Zatzikhoven. Programm des Staats-Gymnasiums in Troppau für das Schuljahr 1882-83. Troppau: n.p., 1883.

_____. Die Beziehungen des Lanzelet zu den Werken Hartmanns v. Aue. Part II of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich v. Zatzikhoven. Programm des Staats-Gymnasiums in Troppau für das Schuljahr 1883-84. Troppau: A. Trassler, 1884.

Neumann, Friedrich. "Connelant in Hartmanns 'Erec.'" Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 83 (1951/52), 271-287.

_____. Geschichte der altdeutschen Literatur (800-1600): Grundriss und Aufriss. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1966.

_____, ed. Gregorius. By Hartmann von Aue. Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters, NS 2. Wiesbaden: F.A. Brockhaus, 1958.

_____. "Wann dichtete Hartmann von Aue?" In: Studien zur deutschen Philologie des Mittelalters (Friedrich Panzer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Sept. 1950 dargebracht). Ed. Richard Kienast. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1950, pp. 59-72. Rpt. in Neumann's Kleinere Schriften zur deutschen Philologie des Mittelalters. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969, pp. 42-56.

Newstead, Helaine. "Perceval's Father and Welsh Tradition." The Romanic Review, 36 (1945), 3-31.

Nitze, W.A. "Sans et matière dans les oeuvres de Chrétien de Troyes." Romania, 44 (1915-17), 14-36.

Norman, Frederick, Nachwort. Lanzelet. By Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Ed. Karl A. Hahn. Frankfurt a.M., 1845; rpt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965, pp. 283-292.

Ó'Riain-Raedel, Dagmar. Untersuchungen zur mythischen Struktur der mittelhochdeutschen Artusepen: Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, "Lanzelet"-Hartmann von Aue, "Erec" und "Iwein." Philologische Studien und Quellen, 91. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1978.

Öhmann, Emil. "Anklänge an Ulrichs von Zazikhoven Lanzelet in Nibelungenlied, Nibelungenklage und Wigalois." Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 47 (1946), 61-82.

Panzer, Friedrich. Rev. of Étude sur Hartmann d'Aue, by F. Piquet. Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 31 (1899), 520-549.

Paris, Gaston. "Études sur les romans de la Table Ronde. Lancelot du Lac." Romania, 10 (1881), 465-496; 12 (1883), 459-534.

_____. Rev. of Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur. Erster Theil. Von den ersten Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters (1892), by Wolfgang Golther. Romania, 22 (1893), 164-167.

_____. "Ulrich de Zazikhoven et Arnaud Daniel." Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes, 26 (1865), 250-254.

Patch, Howard Rollin. The Other World according to Descriptions in Medieval Literature. Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, NS 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Paton, Lucy Allen, trans. Sir Lancelot of the Lake: A French Prose Romance of the Thirteenth Century. London: George Routledge, 1929.

_____. Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance. 2nd ed. New York: B. Franklin, 1960.

Paul, Hermann. "Kritische Beiträge zu den Minnesingern." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 2 (1876), 406-560.

_____. "Zum Leben Hartmanns von Aue." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 1 (1874), 535-539.

Pauphilet, Albert. Rev. of Étude sur le Lancelot en prose, by F. Lot. Romania, 45 (1918/19), 514-534.

Peetz, Helmut. Der Monolog bei Hartmann von Aue: Mit einem Anhang: Der Monolog bei Ulrich von Zatzikhoven und Wirnt von Gravenberg. Diss. Greifswald 1911. Greifswald: H. Adler, 1911.

Pérennec, René. "Artusroman und Familie: 'daz welsche buoch von Lanzelete,'" Acta Germanica: Jahrbuch des südafrikanischen Germanistenverbandes, 11 (1979), 1-51.

_____. "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Lanzelet. Traduction en francais moderne. Accompagnée d'une introduction et de notes." Diss. Université de Paris 1970. Vol. II.

Peter, Arthur, "Die deutschen Prosaromane von Lanzelot." Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, NS 16 (1883), 129-185.

Pfeiffer, Franz. Freie Forschung. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur und Sprache. Vienna: Tendler, 1867.

_____. Rev. of Des Minnesangs Frühling, ed. by Karl Lachmann and Moriz Haupt. Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, 3 (1858), 484-508.

_____. Rev. of Grundrisz zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung, by Karl Goedeke. Germania: Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde, 2 (1857), 491-505.

Philipot, Emmanuel. Rev. of Studies on the Libeaus Desconus, by William Henry Schofield. Romania, 26 (1897), 290-305.

_____. "Un épisode d'Érec et Énide: la 'Joie de la Cour.'-Mabon l'enchanteur." Romania, 25 (1896), 258-294.

Piper, Paul, ed. Hartmann von Aue und seine Nachahmer. Part II of Höfische Epik. Vol. IV of Deutsche National-Litteratur. Stuttgart: Union Deutsche, 1892.

Raynouard, F. Choix des poésies originales des troubadours. Paris, 1816-1821; rpt. Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1966. Vol. II.

Reid, Margaret J.C. The Arthurian Legend: Comparison of Treatment in Modern and Mediaeval Literature: A Study in the Literary Value of Myth and Legend. 1938; rpt. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.

Rhys, John. Studies in the Arthurian Legend. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

Richey, Margaret Fitzgerald. "The German Contribution to the Matter of Britain, with Special Reference to the Legend of King Arthur and the Table Round." Medium Aevum, 19 (1950), 26-42.

Richter, Werner. Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven. Deutsche Forschungen, 27. Frankfurt a.M.: Diesterweg, 1934.

_____. "Der literarische Raum des Lanzelet von Ulrich von Zazikhofen." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 75 (1938), 33-39.

Robertson, John George. A History of German Literature. 2nd ed. Rpt. Edinburgh/London: William Blackwood, 1933.

Rosenfeld, Hans-Friedrich. "Geschâchzabelt." Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 31 (1930), 85-92.

_____. Rev. of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, by Werner Richter. Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 169 (1936), 84-87.

Rosenhagen, Gustav. "Muntane Cluse (Parz. 382, 24)," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 29 (1897), 150-164.

_____. Untersuchungen über Daniel vom Blühenden Tal vom Stricker. Kiel: C. Schaidt, 1890.

_____. "Zobel von Connelant." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 55 (1917), 301, 302.

Ruberg, Uwe. Raum und Zeit im Prosa-Lancelot. Medium Aevum: Philologische Studien, 9. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1965.

_____. "Die Suche im Prosa-Lancelot." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 92 (1963), 122-157.

Ruh, Kurt. 'Reinhart Fuchs,' 'Lanzelet,' Wolfram von Eschenbach, Gottfried von Strassburg. Vol. II of Höfische Epik des deutschen Mittelalters. Grundlagen der Germanistik, 25. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1980.

_____. Von den Anfängen bis zu Hartmann von Aue. Vol. I of Höfische Epik des deutschen Mittelalters. Grundlagen der Germanistik, 7. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1967.

_____. "Lancelot." Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte, 33 (1959), 269-282.

_____. "Der 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhofen: Modell oder Kompilation?" In: Deutsche Literatur des späten Mittelalters: Hamburger Colloquium 1973. Eds. Wolfgang Harms and L. Peter Johnson. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1975, pp. 47-55.

Salmon, Paul. Literature in Medieval Germany. Introductions to German Literature, 1. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.

Salowsky, Hellmut. "Ein Hinweis auf das Lanzelet-Epos Ulrichs von Zazikhoven in der Manessischen Liederhandschrift. Zum Bilde Alrams von Gresten." Heidelberger Jahrbücher, 19 (1975), 40-52.

Salzer, Anselm. Erste bis sechste Periode: Von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Dreissigjährigen Kriege. Vol. I of Illustrierte Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. Vienna: Leo-Gesellschaft, [1912].

Saran, Franz. Hartmann von Aue als Lyriker. Eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1889.

_____. "Über Hartmann von Aue." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 23 (1898), 1-108.

Scherer, Wilhelm. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. 6th ed. by Edward Schröder. Rpt. Berlin: Weidmann, 1894.

Scheunemann, Ernst. Artushof und Abenteuer: Zeichnung höfischen Daseins in Hartmanns Erec. Deutschkundliche Arbeiten, A. Allgemeine Reihe, 8. Breslau: Maruschke und Berendt, 1937.

Schilling, Georgius Nicolaus. "De Usu dicendi Ulrici de Zatzikhoven." Diss. Halle 1866.

Schirokauer, Arnold. "Studien zur mittelhochdeutschen Reimgrammatik." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 47 (1923), 1-126.

Schmidt, Klaus M. "Frauenritter oder Artusritter? Über Struktur und Gehalt von Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven 'Lanzelet.'" Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 98 (1979), 1-18.

Schmolke-Hasselmann, Beate. Der arthurische Versroman von Chrestien bis Froissart: Zur Geschichte einer Gattung. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 177. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1980.

Schneider, Hermann. Heldendichtung, Geistlichendichtung, Ritterdichtung. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1925.

_____. "Höfisches Epos." In: Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte. Eds. Paul Merker and Wolfgang Stammler. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1925/26. Vol. I, pp. 512-519.

_____. Rev. of Des Minnesangs Frühling. Untersuchungen, by Carl von Kraus. Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 59 (1940/41), 67-76.

Schofield, William Henry. English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer. 1906; rpt. London: MacMillan, 1914.

Schröder, Edward. "Zur Chronologie der höfischen Epik." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 51 (1909), 106-109.

Schröder, Werner. "Zur Chronologie der drei grossen mittelhochdeutschen Epiker." Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte, 31 (1957), 264-302.

Schultz, James A. "'Lanzelet': A Flawless Hero in a Symmetrical World." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur [Tübingen], 102 (1980), 160-188.

Schultz, Paul. Die erotischen Motive in den deutschen Dichtungen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Greifswald: F.W. Kunicke, 1907.

Schüppert, Helga. "Minneszenen und Struktur im 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven." Würzburger Prosastudien, 2 (1975), 123-138.

Schütze, Paul. "Das volkstümliche Element im Stil Ulrich von Zatzikhovens." Diss. Greifswald 1883.

Schwietering, Julius. Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters. Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft. [Potsdam, 1940]; rpt. Darmstadt: Hermann Gentner, 1957.

_____. Singen und Sagen. Diss. Göttingen 1908. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1908. Rpt. in his Philologische Schriften. Eds. Friedrich Ohly and Max Wehrli. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1969, pp. 7-58.

Singer, Samuel. "Lanzelet." In his Aufsätze und Vorträge. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912, pp. 144-161.

_____. Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Schweiz im Mittelalter: Ein Vortrag mit anschliessenden Ausführungen und Erläuterungen. Bern: A. Francke, 1916.

_____. Mittelalter und Renaissance: Die Wiedergeburt des Epos and die Entstehung des neueren Romans: Zwei akademische Vorträge. Sprache und Dichtung; Forschungen zur Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft, 2. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1910.

_____. Die mittelalterliche Literatur der deutschen Schweiz. Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, 66, 67. Frauenfeld/Leipzig: Huber, 1930.

_____. Rev. of The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the Year 1300, by James Douglas Bruce. Litteris, 3, No. 2 (Sept. 1926), 116-130.

_____. "Wolframs Stil und der Stoff des Parzival." Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 180 (1916), Abhandlung 4, pp. 1-127.

_____. "Zazikhoven." Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie. 1875-1912. Vol. XLIV, pp. 733, 734.

_____. "Zu Wolframs Parzival." In: Abhandlungen zur germanischen Philologie: Festgabe fur Richard Heinzel... Halle: Niemeyer, 1898, pp. 353-436.

Soudek, Ernst Herbert. "Die Funktion der Namensuche und der Zweikämpfe in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Lanzelet.'" Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik, 2 (1972), 173-185.

_____. "Lancelot und Lanzelet: Zur Verbreitung der Lancelotsage auf deutschem Sprachgebiet." In: Studies in German in Memory of Robert L. Kahn. Eds. Hans Eichner and Lisa Kahn. Rice University Studies, 57, No. 4. Houston: William Marsh Rice University, 1971.

_____. Studies in the Lancelot Legend. Rice University Studies, 58, No. 1. Houston: William Marsh Rice University, 1972.

Sparnaay, Hendricus. De Arthurroman. Voordrachten en Redevoeringen Centrale Opleidingscursussen te Utrecht, 2. [Utrecht]: n.p., 1955.

_____. "Artusroman." In: Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte. Eds. Paul Merker and Wolfgang Stammler. 2nd ed. by Werner Kohlschmidt and Wolfgang Mohr. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1958. Vol. I, pp. 106-117.

_____. "Hartmann von Aue and his Successors." In: Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages; A Collaborative History. Ed. R.S. Loomis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959, pp. 430-442.

_____. Hartmann von Aue: Studien zu einer Biographie. Halle, 1933; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975. Vol. I.

_____. Rev. of Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Lanzelet, trans. by Kenneth G.T. Webster, ed. by Roger Sherman Loomis. Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 51 (1952), 417-419.

_____. Verschmelzung legendarischer und weltlicher Motive in der Poesie des Mittelalters. Groningen: Noordhoff, 1922.

_____. "Zu Hartmanns Kreuzzugslyrik." Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte, 26 (1952), 162-177.

Stolte, Heinz. "Hartmanns sogenannte Witwenklage und sein drittes Kreuzlied." Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte, 25 (1951), 184-198.

Strassberg, Stefania. Die Entführung und Befreiung der Königin Ginevra: Ein Beitrag zur Erläuterung des Lancelot von Crestien de Troyes. Berlin: Triltsch und Huther, 1937.

Thompson, James Westfall. "On the Date of the Lancelot." Modern Language Notes, 52 (1937), 172.

Thoran, Barbara. "Zur Struktur des 'Lanzelet' Ulrichs von Zatzikhoven." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 103 (1984), 52-77.

Thorpe, Lewis. The Lancelot in the Arthurian Prose Vulgate. Wheaton College Monograph Series, 1. Wheaton College, Ill.: Department of English; Wheaton College, 1980.

Tilvis, Pentti. "Über die unmittelbaren Vorlagen von Hartmanns Erec und Iwein, Ulrichs Lanzelet und Wolframs Parzival." Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 60 (1959), 29-65, 129-144.

Viëtor, Karl. "Die Kunstanschauung der höfischen Epigonen." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 46 (1922), 85-124.

Vilmar, Augustus. Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur. 20th edition. Marburg: Elwert, 1881.

Vogt, Friedrich, ed. Des Minnesangs Frühling. Original ed. Karl Lachmann. 3rd ed. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1920.

_____. "Mittelhochdeutsche Literatur." In: Literaturgeschichte. Vol. II, Part I of Grundriss der germanischen Philologie. Ed. Hermann Paul. 2nd ed. Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1901-1909.

Wachsler, Arthur Alexander. "The Celtic Concept of the Journey to the Otherworld and its Relationship to Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelet: A Structural Approach to the Study of Romance Origins." Diss. University of California, Los Angeles 1972.

Wackernagel, Wilhelm, Einleitung. Der Arme Heinrich Herrn Hartmanns von Aue und zwei jüngere Prosalegenden verwandten Inhaltes. Ed. W. Toischer. Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1885.

_____. Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur. Part IV of Deutsches Lesebuch. 2nd ed. by Ernst Martin. Basel: Schweighauser (Hugo Richter), 1879. Vol. I.

_____. "Gewerbe, Handel und Schifffahrt der Germanen." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 9 (1853), 530-578.

Wahnschaffe, Friedrich. Die syntaktische Bedeutung des mittelhochdeutschen Enjambements. Palaestra, 132. Berlin, 1919; rpt. New York: Johnson Reprint, 1967.

Wais, Kurt. "Einführung in die Forschungsgeschichte des arthurischen Romans." In: Der arthurische Roman. Ed. Kurt Wais. Wege der Forschung, 157. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970, pp. 1-18.

Wallner, Anton. Rev. of Der Lanzelet des Ulrich von Zazikhoven, by Werner Richter. Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 54 (1935), 171-175.

Walshe, M.O'C. "The Fabulous Geography of Lanzelet." London Mediaeval Studies, 1 (1937-39), 93-106.

_____. Medieval German Literature: A Survey. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

_____. Rev. of Lanzelet, by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, trans. by Kenneth G.T. Webster, ed. by Roger Sherman Loomis. Modern Language Review, 48 (1953), 99, 100.

Wapnewski, Peter. "Der Gregorius in Hartmanns Werk." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 80 (1961), 225-252.

_____. Hartmann von Aue. 4th ed. Sammlung Metzler, 17. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1969.

Warnatsch, Otto, ed. Der Mantel, Bruchstück eines Lanzeletromans des Heinrich von dem Türlin, nebst einer Abhandlung über die Sage vom Trinkhorn und Mantel und die Quelle der Krone. Germanistische Abhandlungen, 2. Breslau, 1883; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1977.

Webster, Kenneth G.T. "Arthur and Charlemagne." Englische Studien, 36 (1906), 337-369.

_____. Guinevere: A Study of her Abductions. Milton, Mass.: Turtle Press, 1951.

_____, trans. Lanzelet. By Ulrich von Zatzikhoven. Ed. Roger Sherman Loomis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

_____. Rev. of Lancelot and Guinevere, by Tom Peete Cross and William A. Nitze. Modern Language Notes, 46 (1931), 53-57.

_____. "Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's 'Welschez Buoch.'" Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, 16 (1934), 203-228.

_____. "Walter Map's French Things." Speculum, 15 (1940), 272-279.

_____. "The Water-Bridge in Chrétien's 'Charrette.'" Modern Language Review, 26 (1931), 69-73.

Wehrli, Max. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur vom frühen Mittelalter bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts. Vol. I of Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1980.

_____. "Strukturprobleme des mittelalterlichen Romans." Wirkendes Wort, 10 (1960), 334-345.

Weigand, Hermann J. Three Chapters on Courtly Love in Arthurian France and Germany: Lancelot-Andreas Capellanus-Wolfram von Eschenbach's Parzival. University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, 17. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956.

Welz, Dieter. "Lanzelet im Schoenen Walde: Überlegungen zu Struktur und Sinn des Lanzelet-Romans (mit einem Exkurs im Anhang)." Acta Germanica; Jahrbuch des südafrikanischen Germanistenverbandes, 13 (1980), 47-68.

Weston, Jessie L. The Legend of Sir Gawain: Studies upon its Original Scope and Significance. Grimm Library, 7. London, 1897; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1972.

_____. The Legend of Sir Lancelot du Lac: Studies upon its Origin, Development, and Position in the Arthurian Romantic Cycle. Grimm Library, 12. London: David Nutt, 1901.

_____. The Legend of Sir Perceval: Studies upon its Origin, Development, and Position in the Arthurian Cycle. Grimm Library, 17. London, 1906; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1972. Vol. I.

_____. "The Relation of the Perlesvaus to the Cyclic Romances." Romania 51 (1925), 348-362.

_____. "'A Shrieking Bog.'" Folklore, 34 (1923), 379, 380.

_____. The Three Days' Tournament: A Study in Romance and Folk-Lore. London, 1902; [rpt.] New York: Haskell House, 1965.

Wilmanns, W. "Alexanderroman und Lanzelet." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 45 (1901), 245-248.

Wolf, Alois, "'Ja por les Fers ne Remanra' (Chrétiens 'Karrenritter' V. 4600): Minnebann, ritterliches Selbstbewusstsein und concordia voluntatum." Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch im Auftrage der Görres-Gesellschaft, NS 20 (1979), 31-69.

Wulff, F.-A. "Le Conte du Mantel." Romania, 14 (1885), 343-380.

Zenker, Rudolf. Ivainstudien. Vol. I of Forschungen zur Artusepik. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 70. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1921.

_____. "Weiteres zur Mabinogionfrage." Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 41 (1913), 131-165; 43 (1915), 11-73; 45 (1919), 47-120; 48 (1926), 1-102.

Zimmer, H. "Bretonische Elemente in der Arthursage des Gottfried von Monmouth." Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, 12 (1890), 231-256.

Zumthor, Paul. Histoire littéraire de la France médiévale (VI^e-XIV^e Siècles). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954.

Zwierzina, Konrad. Answer to a letter from M.H. Jellinek in "Erec und Lanzelet," by M.H. Jellinek. Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 47 (1904), 270, 271.

_____. "Mittelhochdeutsche Studien." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 45 (1901), 253-393.